

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

SEPTEMBER, 1851.

VOL. III.—NO. V.

BAILEY'S FESTUS.

FESTUS: *A Poem*, by PHILIP JAMES BAILEY. Barrister at Law. Ninth American Edition. Boston: Benjamin B. Mussey & Co. 1850. 12 mo. pp. 412.

THE last great poem of the age! We have little fear that the time will ever come when Smelfungus Redivivus need throw down his pen in despair, declaring that critics must cease to criticise because authors had ceased to write. The present century properly claims the maternity of Reviews, and statistics of the present time would show that it has been increasingly prolific; and yet, if Reviews have any mission to discharge at all, they are scarcely sufficient for the labor-ready prepared to their hands. Notwithstanding the practical business character of the present age, it is emphatically an age of authorship; and, while the great facilities and inducements which it affords may elicit much that is worthless and trashy, we cannot help thinking that it gives birth to more golden thought than any preceding one, and that in its womb there are mighty travailings of spirit, the offspring of which a future age will recognise and cherish. There are, doubtless, great eras in the world's history and in national history, when, in correspondence with the outward phase of the age,

VOL. III.—NO. V. 26•

the seeds of genius are scattered with a more lavish hand, and the growth of thought is more healthful and luxuriant. And then again there are eras which are barren of mind as well as of events. But these eras only unveil themselves in their true character to succeeding generations; and often in the midst of a rich and blooming age we find men bewailing its barrenness.

And with regard to poetry, we see no good reason, if we will but open our eyes, to be in despair of our own age. There too there is a great redundancy and overgrowth, but amidst it all we think there is much that is touched with the enkindling Promethean spark. Just think of the poets that have flourished within living memory:—Gæthe and Schiller and Byron and Coleridge and Scott and Wordsworth and Campbell and Moore and a host of others,—and are we not ashamed to complain of the barrenness of the age? It is an old story that the ancients have gone over the field of thought; and that in poetry Homer and Dante and Shakspeare and Milton have left nothing for moderns to do but imitate and transform. But who did not suppose at one time that Euclid and Archimedes had left nothing for Newton or Leibnitz to do; or that Newton and Leibnitz and Kepler had left nothing for Leverrier and Kirkwood? Who did not think when steam was discovered that the secrets of nature were exhausted? And are we not now prone to look upon the telegraph as the last possible invention? Poetry springs from an abiding substratum of our nature, and although historical and social circumstances may very much modify the products of this substratum, they cannot wholly suppress them. As long as humanity continues to live and think and feel, poetry will find a tongue, though at one time it may herald a victory, at another echo the wail of a weary spirit returning from its forlorn flight after the ineffable and infinite, and at another utter the rapt aspirations of christian hope.

What historical and social circumstances are the most favorable to the development of the *highest form* of poetry, is a question which cannot be settled until men come to agree in their definitions of poetry itself. That the truest poetry should flourish in a barbarous and uncultivated soil, were an anomaly which we could not possibly reconcile with our conceptions of poetry and history. The highest state of civilization will produce vastly inferior poetry of the same *kind* with that of a barbarous age, should it attempt to produce it; but its own poetry will be as much superior in kind. During the growth of any particular form of civilization, there are certain great stages through which the human mind passes; each stage characterised by a peculiar

type of thought, taste and feeling. These give birth to certain products, which are only understood and appreciated when permitted to bloom upon their own soil. When forced from this they become drooping exotics. The products of each age are suited to its exigencies, and the best under the circumstances. It would be impossible to repeat now even the best characteristics of the civilization of mediaeval Europe. Chivalry, for instance, is a green spot upon the history of society in the Middle Ages, yet it would be incongruous, if it were not impossible, to call it forth now. What a figure would the gallant knight-errant make on an English thoroughfare or an American turnpike! What rare sport for curious and impudent boys! In these different stages of civilization, poetry must necessarily assume different types; for poetry, by its very nature sympathises deeply with the human life amid which it blooms. It takes its coloring from the actual joys and sorrows, pleasures and pains, hopes and fears of existing humanity. Poetry, moreover, is always in a great degree the product of the imagination. This too changes its type and direction, with the transition from one stage of society to another. Just so is it in the history of the single individual. It is a common remark, that in youth the imagination is strongest, and declines as the judgment matures. We are disposed to think it a mistake. In manhood we cease to feel the power of those lower workings of the imagination, which in youth clothed for us the Adventures of Lemuel Gulliver, Robinson Crusoe or the Pilgrim's Progress, with all the soberness of literal reality. But the imagination has not decayed. It has risen to a higher sphere, and is conversant with purer, loftier more spiritual images. It wings through the empyrean regions of the ideal, with scarcely a sensible form to bear up its flight. Now apply this to poetry as it comes before us as the product of different stages of civilization. In a semi-barbarous age the imagination is conversant with lower forms, drawn principally from nature and man's immediate relations, and, in analogy with the law as exhibited in the individual, its pictures are intensely vivid. It grasps with a firmer hold and clings with a childlike faith. But as society advances the field of perception widens, the sphere of ideas becomes enlarged, and the imagination rises to higher forms and more pure and spiritual creations; grasped with less tenacity and exhibited less tangibly, simply because more ethereal. In evidence of this it were only necessary to compare the types of imagination as displayed successively in the old heroic poets of Germany, in the mediaeval bards of chivalry, in Dante; in Chaucer, in Spenser, in Shakespeare, in Milton and, we might

add without presumption, in "Festus;" for the dizzy flights of imagination form the most remarkable feature of the book.

It is an old complaint that a true poet is not appreciated in his own times, and doubtless there is much ground for it. This seems an untoward fact in view of the position we have taken. If the true poet embodies the human thought and feeling among which he breathes, why does not each age recognise and cherish its legitimate offspring? To this a double answer may be given: first, as society is progressive and its poetry is its highest product, in a certain sense,—its loftiest and most spiritual aspiration,—it is greatly in advance of the common mind, and while it gathers up and embodies its feeling and sympathies, it yet possesses an element which raises it above the appreciation of the masses. The true poet of an age is not only, to a large extent, its historian but is emphatically its *vates*, its *seer*, who stands upon the verge of its horizon, and looks into the region beyond. Secondly, an age never comes to a clear consciousness of itself, of its wants, and of its vocation. Hence the usual fate of reformers, obloquy and persecution. An age hardly ever recognises its distinguishing peculiarities. The eye cannot see itself. We are creatures of the past. The present to us always takes much of its coloring from the memories of the past. We draw from thence our standards of judgment and taste, and we are not prepared to appreciate anything which bears the distinctive characteristics of the present; which is at the same time to be powerfully available for the future. Add to this the fact that we are often the dupes of the past. Distance in time as well as in space, "lends enchantment to the view." The characters of history loom up before us in wonderful proportions like supposed giants in a foggy night, while our contemporaries are passed by as the men and women of every day life. Without meaning to derogate in the least from the true merit of the great poets of antiquity, we cannot help thinking that we practise upon ourselves a very subtle delusion, when we compare them with those of our own times. It requires an immense effort to see each in their just proportions. Familiarity aids this delusion. Here a law of our nature comes into play. The peasant of the Alpine valleys rarely stops to wonder at the huge piles which surround him. It is philosophy as well as scripture, that "a prophet is not without honor, save in his own country and among his own kin."

Believing, as the course of our remarks thus far will show, that poetry is not dead,—that it will never die—we are not surprised to light upon such a poem as the one before us, the pro-

duct of this so-called mechanical age. And, although we will have many exceptions to record against it, we will endeavor to give such an account of it, and to exhibit so much of it as shall induce our readers who love poetry to purchase it for themselves. It might be presumptuous to pronounce definitely upon its absolute merit. We leave this for coming generations. We leave with them also to discover whether it possesses a vaticinative significance, as indicative of a religious tendency of the present age, whether for weal or for woe. That it possesses many elements of a great poem, and that its type of thought, feeling and imagination, is legitimate to the present age, we firmly believe.

The Dedication is dated 1838, which we presume was the date of its first publication in England. It was first published in this country in 1844, and we believe its circulation, both in England and in this country, has been limited.

Before proceeding farther we beg leave to introduce some notices of "Festus" by distinguished Englishmen and English periodicals. Here is one from the *Brittania* :

"Sure we are that Festus will be read, admired and lauded, as one among the most striking, original and powerful productions of the age. Our impression, after a careful and attentive perusal of it, is, that a new poet, and a great poet, is again among us."

Listen to *James Montgomery*, the author of the *Pelican Island* :

"There is a great exuberance of thought and imagery throughout this work, and a profuse expenditure of both, fearless of exhaustion of the author's stores. One feels as if he had, 'eaten the insane root that takes the reason prisoner' in many passages; or of 'the tree of knowledge of good and evil,' with strange elevations of spirit, and stranger misgivings, alternately glowing and shivering through the bosom."

A short, though pithy one from *Mrs. S. C. Hall* :

"There is matter enough in it to float a hundred volumes of the usual prose poetry. It contains some of the most wonderful things I ever read."

We confess we were somewhat startled by reading these and similar notices, and we commenced reading the book in good earnest; and in all candor we must say that "the half was not told us." Nevertheless we will find it necessary to qualify these wholesale praises, for they evidently were not meant to disclose the whole truth. We shall endeavor so to shade our eyes from

the dazzling splendor of "Festus," as to be able to scan its very serious deformities.

The book is pre-eminently the product of the religious spirit. That its religion is christianity,—or rather that it possesses enough of christianity to save it from being merely deistical—we would fain hope. But of this more hereafter. The author seems to be one of those burning, impassioned spirits, with great temptations and greater aspirations, whom nothing earthly can satisfy, who are intensely alive to their relations to God and to the future, and who long for something better and more enduring. The following passage in the mouth of Festus, is, as we shall learn presently, a life-picture of the author himself.

"Come, let us to the hills! where none but God
Can overlook us; for I hate to breathe
The breaths and think the thoughts of other men.
In close and clouded cities, where the sky
Frowns like an angry Father mournfully.
I love the hills and I love loneliness.
And Oh! I love the woods, those natural fanes
Whose very air is holy; and we breathe
Of God; for he doth come in special place,
And, while we worship, He is there for us!"—p. 100.

There is perhaps in his nature a slight tinge of misanthropy, which, struggling as it ever is with a world-embracing love and deep heart-yearnings, takes a peculiar form, and renders his character often apparently contradictory. He hates men for their follies and stupidities, but his heart yearns towards them when he remembers they are made in the image of God.

The depth of the author's own religious sensibilities gives him a sort of holy daring, which in many minds will expose him to the charge of irreverence. He uses the name of God with the utmost familiarity. He introduces as speakers not only angels, saints and devils, but God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. He lays his scenes in the deepest arcana of the spirit world. He confronts, unabashed, the dazzling splendor of the eternal throne, and "seems at home, where angels bashful look."

We cannot think this daring arises, as in the case of Byron, from any irreverence in feeling, but from the deep, religious earnestness of the author's nature. We would not judge harshly of such spirits. Indeed we know not that, on this point, others have a right to judge at all. "The Lord looketh upon the heart." Let the author speak for himself:

"He used
 The name of God as spirits use it, barely,
 Yet surely more sublime in nakedness,
 Statuelike, than in a whole tongue of dress.
 Thou knowest, God! that to the full of worship
 All things are worship-full; and Thy great name
 In all its awful brevity hath nought
 Unholy breeding in it, but doth bless
 Rather the tongue that utters it; for me
 I ask no higher office than to fling
 My spirit at Thy feet, and cry Thy name
 God! through eternity."—pp. 262-263.

Charges of irreverence have been made, and hence, to the second English edition from which the one before us is taken, the author has prefixed a *Proem* unfolding the general purpose of the work, and endeavoring to relieve it from these aspersions. Whether he has succeeded, or whether the charge *can be* palliated in the reader's mind, we leave him to judge from a specimen or two from the book itself. Here is the Dedication, addressed to none other than the Supreme God :

"My Father! unto thee to whom I owe
 All that I am, all that I have and can;
 Who madest me in thyself the sum of man
 In all his generous aims and powers to know,
 These first fruits bring I; nor do thou forego
 Marking when I the boyish feat began,
 Which numbers now near three-years from its plan,
 Not twenty summers had imbrowned my brow.
 Life is at blood-heat every page doth prove.
 Bear with it. Nature means Necessity.
 If here be aught which thou canst love, it springs
 Out of the hope that I may earn that love
 More unto me than immortality;
 Or to have strung my harp with golden strings."

Here is the opening of the Poem :

"SCENE—Heaven.

GOD.

Eternity has snowed its years upon them;
 And the white winter of their age is come,
 The World and all its worlds; and all shall end.
Seraphim. God! God! God!
 As flames in skies

We burn and rise
And lose ourselves in Thee!
Years on years!
And nought appears
Save God to be.
God! God! God!
* * * *

Cherubim. As sun and star,
How high or far,
Shew but a boundless sky;
So creature mind
Is all confined
To shew Thee, God, most High!
* * * *

Seraphim and Cherubim. God! God! God!
Thou fill'st our eyes
As were the skies
One burning, boundless sun!
While creature mind,
In path confined,
Passeth a spot thereon.
God! God! God!"

One other extract on this point:

"*Lucifer.* (To *Angel of Earth.*) Knowest thou not
God's son to be the brother and the friend
Of spirit everywhere? Or hath thy soul
Been bound for ever to thy foolish world?"

Angel. Star unto star speaks light, and world to world
Repeats the password of the universe
To God; the name of Christ—the one great word
Well worth all languages in earth or Heaven.

Son of God. Think not I lived and died for thine alone,
And that no other sphere hath hailed me Christ.
My life is ever suffering for love.
In judging and redeeming worlds is spent
Mine everlasting being.

Lucifer. Earth he next
Will judge; for so saith God.

Angel of Earth. Be it not, Lord!
Thou art a God of goodness and of love;
He is the evil of the universe,
And loveth not the earth, Thy Son, nor Thee.
Thou knowest best."—pp. 25-26.

This may not be irreverence, but it certainly looks like daring

familiarity. If there is irreverence it is in the conception and execution of such a poem.

But the reader will be impatient to have some account of the plan and purport of the book. This we feel to be no easy task ; and we promise that it will be, at best, but very imperfectly done.

We may say, summarily, that the general drift of the Poem is to unfold the philosophy of creation and redemption,—according to the author's conception of it,—including the ministry of evil ; and descending to many of the details of human life :—the loves, hopes, joys, sorrows, temptations, sufferings, sins, of living men and women. As the author himself says of it, “ it has a plan, but no plot. Life hath none.” It is perhaps more like tragedy than any other of the distinctive forms of poetry ; yet it is not a tragedy, nor a comedy, nor a lyric, nor an epic, nor anything else but simply a poem. It is tragical, comic, lyrical, epic, all together. It is simply a succession of scenes, following each other without any special dramatic connection, yet all tending to one great end, and laid in every conceivable, and in many an inconceivable place, in the universe. It is a series of panoramic views, unveiling to us the doings in Heaven, earth and hell, and winding up with the final consummation of all things. Yet it enters deeply, as we said, into human life ; indeed its great burden is the history of a single soul. We are told in the Proem that “ its sole end points to God the Father's glory,” and unfolds how,

“ He loves to order a chance soul
Chosen out of the world, from first to last.
And all along it is the heart of man
Emblemed, created and creative mind.
It is a statued mind and naked heart
Which is struck out.”—p. 8.

Of the Hero of the Poem, he says :

“ The mortal is the model of all men ;
The foibles, follies, trials, sufferings—
And manifest and manifold are they—
Of a young, hot, unworld-schooled heart that has
Had its own way in life, and wherein all
May see some likeness of their own,—’tis these
Attract, unite, and, sunlike, concentrate
The ever-moving system of our feelings.
The hero is the world-man, in whose heart
One passion stands for all, the most indulged.
The scenes wherein he plays his part are life,

A sphere whose centre is co-heavenly
With its divine original and end."—pp. 9-10.

This hero is Festus; a youth of dazzling gifts and impassioned nature,—the rare child of genius,

"his heart all-lit with love,
Like to the rolling sea with living light;—
Hopeful and generous and earnest; rich
In commune with high spirits, loving truth
And wisdom for their own divinest selves:
Tracking the deeds of the world's glory, or
Conning the words of wisdom, Heaven-inspired,
As on the soul, in pure effectual ray,
The bright, transparent atoms, thought by thought,
Fall fixed for evermore."—p. 22.

One might say of him as Aubrey de Vere said of Coleridge:

"And mighty voices from afar came to him;
Converse of trumpets held by cloudy forms,
And speech of choral storms.
Spirits of night and moontide bent to woo him—"

Such is the hero of the poem, and this hero, as we are afterwards unequivocally given to understand, is Philip James Bailey himself. The poem is

"The life-writ of a heart,
Whose firmest prop and highest meaning was
The hope of serving God as poet-priest."—p. 8.

Here then is a remarkable characteristic of the book. There have been other poets, who have unconsciously given the tinge of their personal character to their writings. The character of Byron gleams through all his poetry. You see it in the background like a haunting ghost, which will not away at your bidding; and it so happens that the character of Byron is such as the fewest can love, and his poetry is cursed by its presence. But here the personal character of the author does not merely gleam unconsciously through the surface, but is openly and deliberately portrayed at full length. It forms the staple of the book. There is a remarkable scene commencing on page 241, between *Festus*, *Helen* and a *Student*, in which Festus describes to the Student a friend whom he once knew; some scraps of which description we will give:

"Festus. He had no times of study and no place;
All places and all times to him were one.

His soul was like the wind-harp, which he loved,
 And sounded only when the spirit blew.
 Sometime in feasts and follies, for he went
 Life-like through all things; and his thoughts then rose
 Like sparkles in the bright wine, brighter still.
 Sometimes in dreams, and then the shining words
 Would wake him in the dark before his face.
 All things talked thoughts to him. The sea went mad,
 And the wind whined as 't were in pain, to shew
 Each one his meaning; and the awful sun
 Thundered his thoughts into him; and at night
 The stars would whisper theirs, the moon sigh hers."—p. 254.

Again:

"So he applied him to all themes that came;
 Loving the most to breast the rapid deeps
 Where others had been drowned, and heeding nought
 Where danger might not fill the place of fame.
 And 'mid the magic circle of those sounds,
 His lyre rayed out, spell-bound himself he stood,
 Like a stilled storm. It is no task for suns
 To shine. He knew himself a bard ordained,
 More than inspired, of God, inspirited:—
 Making himself like an electric rod
 A lure for lightning-feelings."—p. 261.

He goes on to describe a poem which his friend wrote and the description gives us the book before us in miniature; and, as if all his powers were concentrated upon the picture, like rays of the sun converging to the focal point, it glows and burns with an unearthly brightness. After the description the scene closes thus:

" Student.	Say, did thy friend
Write aught beside the work thou tell'st of?	
Festus.	Nothing.
After that, like the burning peak, he fell	
Into himself, and was missing ever after.	
Student.	If not a secret, pray who was he?
Festus.	I"—p. 289.

To the reader of "Festus" this is a startling avowal. It strikes us as a daring and hazardous experiment. When we remember the character of Festus as it towers and flames before us in the former part of the book, we cannot help asking ourselves, "is it possible the author intends that as his own portrait?" But the avowal is in character with the general tone

and spirit of the book. It is characterised by daring or even recklessness. The truth is the poem is written on a hazardous plan; on a plan on which none but a great genius could escape humiliating failure. We are not sure that the author has not slightly over estimated his powers. But this appears only in some minor scenes, which hold the same place relatively to the entire work, which the feat of Milton's angels in hurling mountains holds to the *Paradise Lost*. It is the "naked heart" of the author which is struck out in the Poem. Is it the curse or the salvation of it? This will be according as it is hated or loved. For our own part, when we had reached the end of the book, notwithstanding the thrill of pleasure it left, we had so often alternately loved and despised the character we had been studying, that we found it difficult to balance accounts. We must proceed with the plan of the Poem.

The first scene it will be remembered, is laid in Heaven, and it will be seen that it much resembles the opening of that old, inspired epic, the book of Job. After the song of Cherubim and Seraphim, quoted above, *Lucifer* speaks, and is answered:

"God.

What wouldst thou, *Lucifer*?

Lucifer.

There is a youth

Among the sons of men I fain would have

Given up wholly to me.

God.

He is thine,

To tempt.

Lucifer. I thank Thee, Lord!

God.

Upon his soul

Thou hast no power. All souls are mine for aye.

And I do give thee leave to this that he

May know my love is more than all his sin,

And prove unto himself that nought but God

Can satisfy the soul He maketh great.

Lucifer.

In him of whom I ask, I seek once more

To tempt the living world, and then depart.

[Heaven,

The Holy Ghost. And I will trallow him to the ends of

That though he plunge his soul in sin like a sword

In water, it shall nowise cling to him.

He is of Heaven. All things are known in Heaven,

Ere aimed at upon earth. The child is chosen."—pp. 20, 21.

This is the key to the whole Poem. The rest is the history

of the temptations and soul-struggles of the chosen one, often running through long, labyrinthine windings, where the closest attention is required to retain the clue.

Moreover, Festus is the last man :

"God.

The earth whereon

He dwells, this grain selected from the sands •

Of life, dies with him.

Lucifer.

God ! I go to do

Thy will."—p. 24.

The first scene is thus an index to the book. In the next the temptation begins. Festus is alone, amid a landscape of wood and water, at sunset, soliloquising upon himself and the world around him. He chafes and frets, like a caged eagle, under the restraints of his limited being, and feels the wish for a higher, wider sphere, in which to launch his spirit-wing,

"across the mind

Rush, like a rocket tearing up the sky."

He longs for boundless power and omnipotence of knowledge.

"Mind must subdue. To conquer is its life.

Why mad'st Thou not one spirit, like the sun,

To king the world ? And oh ! might I have been

That sun-mind ; how I would have warmed the world

To love and worship and bright life !" —p. 31.

At this moment *Lucifer* appears, and by fiendishly tempering his address with scoffs, ridicule and promises, he lures the soul with bright visions of that for which it longed. Festus is overcome, yields himself a captive, and promises to accompany his tempter ; but asks a breathing time until midnight. The next scene is at midnight, amid wood and water. The dialogue and the temptation continue. The re-actings of Festus' better nature are lulled for the time. His eager spirit catches at the bait of knowledge and power. He is ready, he bids farewell to the loved scenes of his youth, and departs with the fiend. This scene contains some passages of great power and pathos. Nothing can exceed the impassioned tenderness of Festus' recital of his early love of the dead Angela. And yet there is something about it which makes one shrink. She died of grief at his desertion, as we learn afterwards, and his repentance, though full of pangs, is too much pervaded by the reckless spirit, which casts itself and all its sins upon the bosom of destiny.

Festus and Lucifer next appear upon a mountain at sunrise, and hold high and burning discourse upon nature, creation, sin, heaven, hell, time and eternity. Lucifer pours oil upon the glowing aspirations of the youth, until they blaze and rage with an unhallowed flame. Nothing could be more finely attempered than is the address of the fiend to the ardent spirit of Festus. He is enraptured with his guide :

"Thou thundercloud of spirits, darkning
The skies and wrecking earth ! Could I hate men
How I should joy with thee, even as an eagle,
Nigh famished, in the fellowship of storms ;
But I still love them."—p. 58.

He is still unsatisfied. He demands a spirit of purest essence, an "ethereal slave," to be with him, and obey him, and unfold to him the deepest secrets of the elements,—such a spirit as he has often seen "in the divine insanity of dreams." Lucifer bids him call to the elements to yield him one. He invokes the "green, dewy earth :"

"Speak to me !
I am thy son. Canst thou not now, as once,
Bring forth some being dearer, liker to thee
Than is my race,—Titan or tiny fay,
Stream-nymph or wood-nymph ?

Lucifer. *More's*
The pity. Call elsewhere ! Old Earth is hard
Of hearing, maybe.

Festus. *I beseech thee, Sea !*
Tossing thy wavy locks in sparkling play,
Like to a child awakening with the light
To laughter. Canst not thou disgorge for me,
From thy deep bosom, deep as Heaven is high,
Of all thy sea-gods one, or sea-maids ?

Lucifer. *None !"—pp. 61-62.*

He turns to the fire slumbering like a stern warrior in his rocky fort, and demands a "flaming imp or messenger, of empyrean element." Failed, he addresses to the air a long invocation which we would like to quote did space permit, it closes thus :

"Monarch of all the elements ! hast thou
No soft Eolian sylph, with sightless wing,
To spare a mortal for an hour !

Lucifer. Peace, peace!
 All nature knows that I am with thee here,
 And that thou need'st no minor minister.
 To thee I personate the world—its powers,
 Beliefs, and doubts and practices.
Festus. Are all
 Mine invocations fruitless, then?
Lucifer. They are.
 Let us enjoy the world!"—p. 64.

Here is the bait; and the mind of Festus, chagrined by his fruitless longings, is prepared to sieze it.

The next is a scene of pure but burning love, between Festus and Clara. Festus talks darkly sometimes, and Clara points him to God and Heaven. It is a scene which would leave gentle, holy thoughts behind it, did not the spectral remembrance of Angela haunt the mind. Festus and Lucifer again meet "anywhere." The youth is mortified and moody, and a stormy quarrel and separation follow. Again they meet, as though nothing had happened, at noon, in the market-place of a country town. The Devil preaches a characteristic sermon to the crowd, from the steps of the old grey market-cross. He tells them plain truths, without mincing, in sufficiently diabolical style, and the crowd put him down as a ranter. A prayer by Festus, which we read with much pain, and a hymn by the Devil, close the exercises of the occasion. We think this scene will at least awaken the curiosity of the reader.

We cannot pass by the next scene without notice. It is a ride around the world, which Lucifer and Festus take upon the twin steeds Ruin and Darkness. We notice it, not only as exhibiting a phase of the temptation, but also as evincing the author's power of versification, which seldom, in the other parts of the book, appears to much advantage. Here the flow of the verse and the harmony of the rhyme are often perfectly enchanting. We seem to be borne along as merrily and wildly as the gallant horsemen themselves.

"SCENE—*The Surface.*

Lucifer and Festus.

Lucifer. Wilt ride?

Festus. I'll have an hour's ride.

Lucifer. Be mine the steeds! be me the guide!
 Come hither, come hither,
 My brave black steed!
 And thou, too, his fellow,

Hither with speed!
 Though not so fleet
 As the steeds of Death,
 Your feet are as sure,
 Ye have longer breath.
 Ye have drawn the world
 Without wind or bait,
 Six thousand years,
 And it waxeth late;
 So take me this once,
 And again to my home,
 And rest ye and feast ye.
 They come, they come."—p. 101.

Safely mounted they dash away.

"*Festus.* Horrah! hurrah!
 The noblest pace the world e'er saw.
 I swear by Heaven we'll beat the sun,
 In the longest heat that ever was run;
 If we keep it up as we have begun."

They sweep over the world, visiting its every land, and making passing comments as they go. Festus is bewildered with delight.

"*Festus.* I swear by every atom which exists,
 I better love this reckless ride
 O'er hill and forest, lake and river wide;
 O'er sunlit plain and through the mountain mists,
 Than aught which thou hast given beside."—p. 104.

From above the shore of Hindostan, they plunge upon the wave, and find their steeds expert swimmers.

"*Festus.* Away, away upon the whitening tide.
 Like lover hastening to embrace his bride,
 We hurry faster than the foam we ride.
 Dashing aside the waves which round us cling,
 With strength like that which lifts an eagle's wing
 Where the stars dazzle and the angels sing.

Lucifer. We scatter the spray,
 And break through the billows,
 As the wind makes way
 Through the leaves of the willows!"—p. 106.

They think of the gems and untold beauties of the coral-lined bottom of the deep.

"*Lucifer*. Hold hard, and follow me!
Well, now we have travelled upon the waves,
Wilt travel a time beneath?
And visit the sea-born in their caves;
And look on the rainbow-tinted wreath
Of weeds, beset with pearls, wherewith
The mermaid binds her long green hair,
Or rouse the sea-snake from his lair?

Festus. Ay, ay! down let us dive!"—p. 103.

Throughout the scene are scattered some passages of great lyrical beauty. Take the following:

"Oh! happy, if at last I lie
Within some pebbled and coral cave;
While over head the booming surge
And moaning billow shall chaunt my dirge;
And the storm-blast, as it sweepeth by,
Shall, answering, howl to the mermaid's sigh,
And the nightwind's mournful minstrelsy,
Their requiem over my grave."—p. 110.

The ride finished, Festus avows:—

"I am bound to thee for ever
By the pleasure of this day;
Henceforth we will never sever,
Come what come may!"—p. 112.

But we cannot follow the thread of the play in detail as it winds through the consecutive scenes. Festus follows his infernal guide through the central fire-crypts of the world; through the regions of the air and boundless space; through sun and planets, in one of which he meets the spirit of Angela; they forgive the past, and pledge their spirit-love with burning vows; through Heaven and hell: anywhere and everywhere. From what he has learned of the book, the reader may well judge that some of these scenes make one tremble for the daring genius which attempted them: and he may well imagine also that in some of them failure was inevitable. In all, the insatiate desires of the youth for knowledge and power are fanned and mocked; and everywhere his better nature reacts, and he longs only for God and a sense of His love. Often the scenes descend to earth and present us pictures of various hues. Festus is tempted with fashion, with wine, with love and beauty; and in all he yields and repents. His "guilt and glory lay in love,"—and more guilt than glory to our mind. We have frequent scenes

beneath the star of eve, and in twined bowers, in which figure successively, besides the ethereal Angela, as the loves of his heart, Clara, Helen, Marian and Elissa. His love to these is full of tender and passionate earnestness. All is pure and taintless as the dream of a seraph. And yet each one is in turn forsaken,—not betrayed but deserted—and their love reserved for the heavenly state. Let us pause a moment over the history of Elissa, and wonder at the imagination which conceived it; while we may detest the heart which gleams through it all. Lucifer, it seems, had been sporting among the fair in the shape of a handsome gallant, and we are introduced to a love scene, in a garden and bower by the sea, between him and his Elissa. He talks love as passionately as ever did human wight, sings to her of Lucifer the star, and throws out dark double meanings which make one shudder. Festus enters; is introduced as a friend; Lucifer is called away and confides the maiden to the care of the youth; saying, aside:

“Why, hell would laugh to learn I had been in love!”

In a following scene we have Festus and Elissa struggling with involuntary love, and finally yielding the avowal that each can love no other. Lucifer is led in by a servant, as a singer, and sings a song of warning; at last reveals himself, and departs, threatening that worse shall ensue. Again we have Elissa alone, in a garden and bower by the sea, apostrophising to the coming Festus. Lucifer enters, and in a tone of refined and triumphant malignity, tells her he is come to bid her die. She feels the pulse of life ebbing; Festus enters; Elissa dies; Lucifer is scouted with abhorrence, but goes with the significant question:

“Who seeks the other first?”

Then comes the last lure—that of power, and it is taken.

“*Lucifer.* I proffer now the power which thou dost long
Say but the word, and thou shalt press a throne [for.
But less than mine—the scarcely less than God’s;—
A throne, at which earth’s puny potentates
May sue for slavedoms—and be satisfied.

Festus. I have had enough of the infinities:

I am moderate now. I will have the throne of earth.

Lucifer. Thou shalt. Yet, mind!—with that, the world

Festus. I can survive. [must end.

Lucifer. Nay, die with it must thou.”—p. 370.

The youth recoils for a moment, but again grasps it. He is weary of life—sick of the world and men, and feels that death

will be some relief at all risks. At the same time are mingled longings to return to the bosom of God, and bathe in the pure effulgence of heavenly existence. The angels descend to talk with him of his mighty destiny. His guardian angel nerves him for the "miracle of death." Again we have a gathering of kings and people, and Festus as a monarch speaks from his throne. Lucifer is his minister of state, and promulgates his laws for universal obedience. But the catastrophe comes, as threatened in the first scene.

Festus. Hark! thou fiend! dost hear?

Lucifer. Ay! it is the death groan of the sons of men—
Thy subjects—King!

Festus. Why hadst thou this so soon?

Lucifer. It is God who brings it all about—not I.

Festus. All around me die. The earth is one great death-bed.

Clara. Oh! save me, Festus! I have fled to thee,
Through all the countless nations of yon dead—
For well I knew it was thou who sattest there,
To die with thee, if that thou art not Death:
And, if thou wert, I would not shrink from thee.
I am thine own, own Clara!"—pp. 383-384.

She rests in his arms, but soon sinks and dies in the last "kiss of life and death." The scene closes with the death of Festus.

The scenes which follow wind up the plan both of the book and the universe; and in a theological view are painfully startling. Lucifer is confined to Hades, to await God's judgment. Saints, angels and the graces, walk the millennial earth. In Hades, an Arch-angel, Festus, Death, Lucifer and the man-made Gods of antiquity, Jove, Brahm, Boodh and Odin, hold mysterious converse on their state, and feel a dim presentiment of their coming redemption. In the regions of the air, the great battle between "Michael and his angels and the Devil and his angels," is fought, and the hosts of hell vanquished. At Judgment, the nations of the earth are summoned, a universal amnesty proclaimed, and all men saved, except Festus. His judgment is reserved for the Heaven of Heavens. There in the presence of the Recording Angel, Angels and Lucifer, the Son of God proclaims him saved, and Festus pours out his soul in boundless gratitude. Lucifer is about taking his leave, wishing for death, but is arrested by the voice of God, who tells him his mission is accomplished, the necessity of evil is past, he too is

redeemed by the blood of Christ, and his services shall be rewarded.

"Take, Lucifer, thy place. This day art thou
Redeemed to archangelic state. Bright child
Of morning, once again thou shinnest fair
O'er all the starry ornaments of light."—p. 410.

With him are restored all the fallen angels and join in the anthem of praise.

"SON OF GOD.

All God hath made are saved. Heaven is complete.

Guardian Angel. Hither with me!

Festus. But where are those I love?

Angel. Yon happy troop!

Festus. Ah! blest ones, come to me!

Loves of my heart, on earth; and soul in Heaven!

Are ye all here, too, with me?

All.

All!

Festus,

It is Heaven."—p. 410.

We leave it an open question, whether this is a sufficient atonement for faithless love upon earth.

We are near the end of the book but its deponement has not yet transpired. All souls, angelic, human and infernal, are re-absorbed into the primal Deity and God is all and alone!

"THE HOLY GHOST.

Time there hath been when only God was all:

And it shall be again. The hour is named,

When seraph, cherub, angel, saint, man, fiend,

Made pure, and unbelievably uplift

Above their present state—drawn up to God;

Like dew into the air—shall be all Heaven;

And all souls shall be in God, and shall be God.

And nothing but God, be.

SON OF GOD.

Let all be God's.

GOD.

World without end, and I am God alone;

The Aye, the Infinite, the Whole, the One.

I only was—nor matter else, nor mind,

The self-contained Perfection unconfined.

I only am—in might and mercy one;

I live in all things and am closed in none.

I only shall be—when the worlds have done,

My boundless Being will be but begun."—pp. 411-412.

We feel that we have been traveling over strange ground ; and before the reader's fervor subsides we will give him the author's parting salutation.

" L'ENVOI.

Read this, world ! He who writes is dead to thee,
 But still lives in these leaves. He spake inspired :
 Night and day, thought came unhelped, undesired,
 Like blood to his heart. The course of study he
 Went through was of the soul-rack. The degré
 He took was high : it was wise wretchedness.
 He suffered perfectly, and gained no less
 A prize than, in his own torn heart, to see
 A few bright seeds : he sowed them—hoped them truth.
 The autumn of that seed is in these pages.
 God was with him, and bade old Time, to the youth,
 Unclench his heart, and teach the book of ages.
 Peace to thee, world !—farewell ! May God the Power,
 And God the Love—and God the Grace, be ours !"

Is it madness or poetic inspiration ? Really we cannot tell. It may be a mixture of both.

Our object has been to give the reader, who has not happened upon the book, an idea of it. Hence we have dealt largely in quotation, feeling assured that no representation of ours could suffice so well. But we asseverate that, in keeping close to the plan, we have given but a few gems of the rich mine of thought and imagery which glittered before us. We passed by several episodes, and lyrics, of great beauty, which nothing but want of space prevented us from transcribing.

From the specimens we have given the reader will have easily perceived the general characteristics of the author's poetry. It is of the lofty, imaginative, impassioned character. Sometimes it rises to foaming Pythic furor. In the midst of this there is much weakness. The truth is his genius moves only by impulse, and although it often enables him to soar nobly, yet when the afflatus is off he sinks low. The want of mature mental training is manifest. These faults, however, may be accounted for by the fact, that the book was written soon after the author had left his teens. If he meant it as the great and only work of his life, we are sorry he did not postpone the final execution of it at least ten years. It was written in that transition stage in the development of such a spirit, when it is dangerous to write anything for the world. Much of it reminds us of Byron, with the additional element of a more earnest, religious spirit. This is all that saves the book from the sulphurous misanthropy of

Manfred. In point of imagination, not only as exhibited in single passages, but in the whole conception of the book, we know of nothing among modern productions—passing by Milton whose type of imagination is very different—with which to compare it. It approaches the gorgeous theological fables of the Oriental Basilides or Valentine. The aspirations of Festus often remind us of Sophia, winging her way from the regions of matter, towards the unfathomable abyss of the primal Essence, and held back by Horus the impersonated time-spirit, the guardian of the boundary between finite knowledge and the infinite. We meet with much that is presumptuous and extravagant;—nay even preposterous. Vaulting ambition always overleaps itself. But these are the faults of a great genius.

The author's cast of imagination makes it difficult for him to put off his distinctive character. He would not make a successful dramatist. This is shown in his female characters. True, they always talk purely, sometimes sweetly, and often naturally. But they are perpetually betrayed into long speeches, in which we hear only the lofty tone and glowing rhapsodies of Festus himself. The versification we cannot examine minutely. It is often smooth and harmonious, and of great rhythmical beauty; but oftener it is rough and lumbering,—full of excrescences and abnormalities. Sometimes there seems to be a studied contempt of artistic effort. But it is in character with the author and the poem.

But what shall we say of the religion of the book,—or rather its theology? We have said it is the product of the religious spirit. This is evident on every page. But so were the reveries of Montanus, and the ravings of the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit. So were the speculations of Manes and the Gnostics. So were the systems of Pelagius and Socinus. The reader will have observed, that the author assumes an air that looks very much like fanaticism. To say that,

“He knew himself a bard ordained,
More than inspired of God, inspirited.”

is certainly pretty bold. We are aware of the almost unbounded franchise which poetry claims and requires, and this alone prevents us from assigning his spiritual consanguinity to the same class with Menander, Mark Stubner and Joe Smith. In the Proem, we are told that the religion of the book is

“Followed out from the book God writ of old;”

and much of it doubtless is. The fundamental doctrines of the

Trinity, the Incarnation and the Atonement are recognised. But there is much besides which evangelical Christianity pronounces to be not found in the "book God writ of old."

In the first place, the whole book is deeply *pantheistic*. Pantheism might be called the natural religion of poetry. It seems to be indigenous to its soil. There is something so beautiful in it, something so fascinating to the imagination, something so congenial to the religious spirit which genius has fired, that it has ever been the Scylla by which poetry has been endangered, when the charybdis of scoffing scepticism had no power to draw it. Religious genius is never safe, except when gazing full-faced, and with a teachable spirit, upon the shining orb of revealed truth. Its pantheistic tendency has been clearly seen from the denouement of the book, which we have given. We will cite a few passages from the body of the Poem :

"But since now earth is as a crumb of Heaven,
And time an atom of eternity,
Neither depends upon the other, both
One essence being emanant from God,
Whose flowings forth are aye and infinite,
And radiant as the rivers of the skies."—p. 340.

Again :

"A world
Is but, perhaps, a sense of God's, by which
He may explain His nature, and receive
Fit pleasure. But the hour is hard at hand,
When Time's grey wing shall winnow all away,
The atoms of the earth, the stars of Heaven ;
When the created and Creator mind
Shall know each other, worlds and bodies both
Put off for aye."—p. 377.

Still farther :

"Man shall mix with Deity
And the Eternal and Immortal make
One Being."—p. 393.

God is expressly called the "great world-soul." Mind is called "pure power—pure god." Space is called a "quality of God." But enough. If this is not Pantheism, Xenophanes and Plotinus, Giordano Bruno and Spinoza, must stand acquitted. Connected, as there always is, with this pantheistic tendency, is a tendency to *fatalism*. This flows like a deep under-current through the whole book. Yet it rarely breaks upon the surface,

and flows so silently that you scarcely note it. Still you cannot but feel its presence, inexorable as the force which binds the stars.

Again, there is an imperfect apprehension of the evil of sin. In a pantheistic system, indeed, the deformity of sin is always overshadowed. It is part of the universe, part of the development of God, and must be explained in some way. Lucifer calls himself "the shadow which creation casts from God's own light," and declares that he is inseparable from the universe. Hear Festus after making an apology for the sad fate of the loved ones he had deserted :

"Let us work out our natures ; we can do
No wrong in them, they are divine, eterne :
'I follow my attraction, and obey
Nature, as earth does.'"—p. 279.

Hear him again when about appearing in the presence of his Judge :

"Forgiveness ? Let it be so : for I know not
What I have done to merit endless pain.
Is pleasure crime ?"—p. 386.

Again :

"Thou wilt not chronicle our sandlike sins ;
For sin is small, and mean, and barren. Good
Only is great, and generous, and fruitful.
Number the mountains, not the sands, O God !"

Sin, in any form is too insignificant to merit eternal punishment. Listen to the Son of God in Hell itself :

"There is nothing final
In all this world but God ; therefore these souls
Whom I see here, and pity for their woes—
But for their evil more—these need not be
Inhelled for ever ; for although once, twice, thrice,
On earth or here they may have put God from them,
Disowned His prophets—mocked His angels—slain
His Son in his mortality—and stormed
His curses back to Him ; yet God is such,
That He can pity still ; and I can suffer
For them, and save them."—p. 327.

It is this imperfect apprehension of the evil of sin, together with a milk-and-water conception of the goodness and benevolence

of God, that is the moving cause, in the author's mind, of the restoration of Lucifer and the fallen angels without repentance and in spite of themselves. Their sin was involved in the constitution of the universe, and so was the atonement of Christ to balance it; and destiny must have its way. It would be interesting and instructive to compare with these views some passages from "the book God writ of old," and see the comparative place which sin holds in the two pictures.

We feel constrained to enter this strong caveat against the theology of a book, which, notwithstanding its great faults, we have read with exhaustless pleasure; and which, we feel sure, will be transmitted to coming ages, as a monument of genius, if nothing else. That it may be made serviceable to some minds, we are confident; that it may be deleterious to others, we are apprehensive; that it will make the world better, we are rather desirous than sanguine.

Oh! when will poetry escape from the damp fog of a vain philosophy, and spread its wing in the pure azure of heavenly truth! When will genius be baptised in "Siloah's brook which flows fast by the oracle of God," and sit and learn at the feet of him who "spake as never man spake!" When shall every Byron's head be joined with a Pollok's heart! In that day, when "HOLINESS TO THE LORD" shall be upon the bells of the horses, and when "there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the Lord of hosts."

Carlisle, Pa.

J. C.

THE CICADAÆ.

THE ambrosial days of the cicadae or the tettiges are clean gone forever! They did belong to the morning of Greece; the golden age of that country. "When Music, heavenly maid, was young," the charming voices of these insectile foresters were properly appreciated. The same tasteful ears, which were capable of catching the distant music of the spheres and of being pleased thereby, were turned also in delicate admiration towards the chirpings of these lowlier, noonday quiristers. The poets especially were taken with them. Hesiod mentions them as the dark-winged, musical tettiges, foretelling the approach of Summer; and Homer calls them the lily-voiced, borrowing his metaphor from the most delicate of flowers. The Athenians saw in them so many traits of character resembling their own, that they regarded them with fraternal affections, and believed that they were possessed of souls and, of course, of human feelings. Like themselves they were indigenous to the soil, and fond of disputation and of song, and of basking in the sunshine of the present. How beautiful is the apologue of Plato respecting them, which he represents Socrates introducing by way of episode, while discoursing apart with his beloved Phædrus, under the plane tree, on love and philosophy!

"*Socrates*.—Spare time indeed we have on hands, as it seems; and now the cicadae, who, as their wont is in the heat, are chanting and disputing over our heads, it strikes me, are looking down upon us. Should they therefore behold us two, like many others, at noon-day, not discoursing but, through laziness of thought, becoming lulled with their music, justly, in sooth, would we excite their derision; they supposing us to be some loafers who had come apart hither to them in this retired spot, like sheep, to take a nap at noonday near the fountain. But, on the other hand, should they behold us discoursing and, as it were, sailing past them, as by Sirens, unseduced by their strains, highly delighted thereat they would be, and perhaps bestow upon us that boon with which the gods have entrusted them for mortals.

"*Phædrus*—But what now is that boon with which the gods have entrusted them? for, as it seems, about this matter I am still uninformed.

"*Socrates*.—In sooth it is not proper that, at any rate, a man devoted to the Muses should, about such matters, be uninformed. It is said then that these cicadae were once men; before the

times of the Muses ; but when the Muses were born and song was displayed, so smitten were some of these men, at that time, with pleasure from it that singing they neglected both their food and drink ; and, on this account unweetingly they came to their untimely ends. From these, however, afterwards sprang up the race of the cicadae, having been endowed by the Muses with this boon, that from the moment of their births they should require no aliment to support them, but without eating and drinking they should continue singing till the days of their departures ; but then, having come to the Muses, it was their bounden duty to report who among mortals they were that revered the Muses and which particular Muse it was that any mortal preferred. To Terpsichore, therefore, on the one hand, they announce who are those that honor her in their dances, and thus they render such persons more beloved. To Erato, on the other hand, they announce who are those that honor her in their amatory strains ; and to the other Muses, in like manner, according to the peculiar provinces of each. To Calliope, however, the most honorable, and, after her, to Urania they announce who are those that pass their time in philosophy, and pursue those arts which are peculiarly theirs ; and then these, who, of all the Muses, are most conversant about heaven and speeches both human and divine, bestow sweetness of speech. Thus, for many reasons, we must talk about something and not sleep at noonday."—*Phaed.* 259.

Of course it was not the intention here of the honey-lipped Plato, to deny that the cicadae were fond of the dew. Their love for this beverage was so well known to the Athenians, that it needed not to be noted by him as an exception. The dew was scattered so plentifully on the leaves before these musicians in the morning, that it required no care nor trouble on their parts to go after it. It interfered not with their singing. They partook of it too not at all as an aliment, but merely for exhilaration. It served to moisten and thus lubricate their throats—or more properly, I should say, those natural bagpipes of theirs under their arms or wings from which their music issued. The shepherds sympathised with these natives, from hearing them contending in song above their heads among the branches, while themselves were engaged in the same delectable employment on the grass in the shade beneath. From their bibacious propensity, however, their disposition to sip the dew and become thus exhilarated, and even intoxicated, it was, we imagine, that the lyric poets were most taken with them. They fancied them to be good fellows well met, full of kindness towards each other, and in good humor with the world and all around them. From

being possessed with some such notion; no doubt, it was that Anacreon was the more inspired, when he responded to one of them in that well known lyric :

ANACREON, ODE XLIII.

Μαχαρίζοις σι, τίττις,

K. v. λ.

"Happy thee we deem, cicada,
As from out the leafy tree-top,
On a little dew enlivened,
Like a monarch, thou art singing.
Thine the things are all around thee,
Whatsoe'er in fields thou seest,
Whatsoe'er the woods are bearing.
Thou beloved art of tillers,
Any ill to no one doing;
Thou art highly prized by mortals,
Of the summer's sweet foreteller.
Fond of thee too are the Muses,
Fond of thee himself Apollo;
And a clear-voiced song he gave thee.
Old age thee doth never trouble,
Wise one, earth-born, fond of singing,
Painless, with a bloodless body,
Almost to the gods thou'rt equal."

The pleased cicada who was honored with this strain, no doubt, in his proper time, like a carrier pigeon, not, however, written down but treasured in his memory, conveyed it to the bowers of the Muses, where in appropriate, imitative style, he rehearsed it to Terpsichore and Erato, who, in their turns, being highly pleased therewith, as is likely, bestowed as a guerdon on their poet a double portion of their spirit. To their fondness for dew-drinking, rather than to their passion for song, I am inclined to think it was owing, that these cicadae were enabled to preserve their immortality. Before the times of the Rosicrucians, the Grecians were of the opinion that the dew drops, which were the tears of Aurora, were somewhat tinctured with the nectar of the higher world, and on that account possessed of the power of bestowing upon those who partook of them largely a never-fading bloom of health and beauty. By these ancients consequently it was believed that the cicadae never died. Very properly, therefore, was Tithonus, the beloved spouse of Aurora, when he had become an old and decrepit man, transformed into one of these insects; for thus while re-

taining his immortality as before, he regained in the metamorphosis, what his lady-love had unfortunately forgotten to ask for him at first from Jupiter, his continued youth and sprightliness. In the legend of Plato, however, above cited, which was spoken when entomology had been a little more studied, it must be confessed they are allowed to be mortal. During the summer, it seems there to be insinuated, they all sooner or later dropped off. It was only their souls that continued to survive. I cannot help thinking, however, that the fabulist does not mean to assert that they shuffled off entirely their corporeal coils. It was only a sort of transformation they underwent. As when emerging from their aurelean state to enter upon their earthly festivities they had burst their shells, and come forth in more genteel forms, so now, at the close of these, when about to enter into a higher sphere, they threw off their outward integuments, their souls did not come forth naked, but possessed of more sylph-like bodies, away they flitted, with improved voices, and on ambrosial wings, into the bowers of the Muses.

As the Romans honored and invoked the Muses, into whose mysteries they had been initiated by the Greeks, it might naturally have been expected that they would have regarded with equally good feelings their winged messengers or prophets. As they had received from the anterior people above mentioned most of their mythology, and caught from them besides, to a great extent, their literary tastes and dilections, it might certainly have been with fairness inferred that they would have listened accordingly in charmed admiration to the cheerful chirpings of these little votaries of the Pierides. Of this, however, I am grieved to say it, no corroborations are to be met with in their books. From their classical associations, the Latin poets were, no doubt, disposed to regard these insects with interest and delight; but from their own experience, as they heard them every summer from their trees, having no ear for their music, they were not so favorably inclined. Belonging to a more warlike and practical nation they were fonder of the bees. Thus Virgil in his *Bucolics*, it is true, where he imitates to a great extent the Grecian verses of Theocritus, associates the cicadae with classical beings and beautiful things; as, for instance, in *Ecloque V* he prophesies that Daphnis would continue to receive honors and praises from the shepherds as long as the bees would be fond of thyme or the cicadae of the dew; but in his *Georgics*, where he draws his lessons and associations more directly from his native fields and woods, he speaks of them less respectfully:

"Et cantu querelae rumpent arbustae cicadae."

He here describes these almost deified minstrels of the Greeks in his own country as actually about to burst the orchards with their incessant, querulous croakings! O, what a falling off was there, my countrymen! No guerdon I trow, would the Mantuan bard be likely to receive from the Muses, at any rate through the intervention of these their tiny messengers, for his having written on them such a line as that.

If even the Roman poets, so closely allied as they were by their literary associations to the Greeks, were yet incapable of properly appreciating the musical abilities of these insects, it is not so much to be wondered at that our modern bards, of different habits and in colder climates, are affected towards them with feelings still less Attical. The fact is the cicadae are seldom if ever mentioned by our modern poets at all. It is only in prose writings now-a-days, by entomologists or compilers of antiquarian dictionaries, they are described; and generally, at the outset, in some such style as this:

"Cicada, a species of insect frequently mentioned by the classical writers. According to Dodwell it is formed like a large fly, with long transparent wings, a dark brown back and yellow belly. It is originally a caterpillar, then a chrysalis and is converted into a fly late in the Spring."—

To the description thus far we put in no demurrer. The cicada among insects, like the nightingale among birds or Jenny Lind among human beings, though genteel enough in his outward appearance, is not in that way remarkable. It is not by gaudy colorings, like the butterfly, that he attracts attention. His whole fort is in his singing. Let us hear then what Mr. Dodwell says of that:

"Dodwell says that nothing is so piercing as their note; nothing at the same time so tiresome and inharmonious, and yet the ancient writers and especially the poets praise the sweetness of their song and Plutarch says they were sacred to the Muses."—*Anthon's Gr. and Lat. Antiq.*

And pray, Mr. Dodwell, whose taste in this particular should be considered the more correct, thine own or that of Plutarch? The Greeks, it is well known, even in their common converse, modulated and intonated their voices so correctly and musically that they seemed almost to be speaking in numbers. Their language, however, on account of its nice inflections and cadences, our thicker Saxon tongues are not sufficiently pliable nor nimble to pronounce properly, and its full beauty and delight, even did

we hear it well spoken, our less aesthetical ears would, in all likelihood, be unqualified for appreciating. Is it not then more than probable that the exquisitely tuned ears of this people were thrilled with melodies from these insects, the most ethereal and refined, which, though still mingled with their music, our grosser senses are totally incapable of taking in?

The ancient Greeks were naturally drawn to pay more attention to the music of birds and insects than has been done by the modern Britons, on account of their spending more of their time out of doors. Owing to their more salubrious atmosphere they could cast themselves, without any detriment to their health or spirits, beneath the shades of trees, and listen improvingly to the chirpers on the branches. Of course, however, according to their tastes, they studied them always more poetically than scientifically. The later Britons, on the other hand, on account of their colder climate, and the happy influences, it becomes me to admit, of christianity on their domestic relations, are fonder of their firesides. Not so much to be wondered at therefore is it that the song of the cicada, if in fact he belong to their country at all, has not been wont to suggest such pleasing associations to the British poets as have been the chirpings of a smaller insect, of a darker hue and without wings, which is accustomed to hail them of an evening from his snug and secret retreat somewhere in the jambs of their fire-places.

“ Little inmate, full of mirth
Chirping on my kitchen hearth,
Wheresoe’er be thine abode,
Always harbinger of good,” &c.

This affectionate ode thus commencing of Vincent Bourne, translated by Cowper, is not a solitary instance, in British poetry, of honor paid to this little colored musician. From Chaucer down to Tennyson his name occurs in almost every description of domestic peace and happiness. Mine own lineage being derived partly from Scottish ancestors, I confess that I have always had, at any rate in the winter, something of a warm side towards the chimney corner. Seated of an evening solitary by mine ingle side frequently have I been soothed, I must admit, and aided in my meditations, by the concomitant chirpings of the contented cricket. Still, I am not pleased with invidious comparisons. The merits of this household serenader, it strikes me, should always be set forth without any disparagement to the cicada of the trees. The two musicians belong to unparallel times and manners. On this account I must say that I am not

at all satisfied with the concluding lines of that domestic ode from which I have already quoted the commencement :

" Though in voice and shape they be
 Formed as if akin to thee,
 Thou surpassest, happier far,
 Happiest grasshoppers that are ;
 Theirs is but a summer's song,
 Thine endures the winter long,
 Unimpaired and shrill and clear,
 Melody throughout the year.
 Neither night nor dawn of day
 Puts a period to thy play :
 Sing then,—and extend thy span
 Far beyond the date of man.
 Wretched man whose hours are spent
 In repining discontent,
 Lives not, aged though he be,
 Half a span compared with thee."

Of all misnomers of which English translators of Greek or Latin have been guilty, (and they are not a few,) I know of none more disparaging and humiliating than that of rendering the name of the divine tettix or cicada by that of grasshopper! The insect thus denominated amongst us, we all know, is not only gawky in his appearance and groveling in his pursuits, but, as for music, in which the cicada revels, he is utterly devoid both of taste and tune. He is really not able to emit any voice whatever from any part of his body; and his whole sense of hearing, as I have been told by entomologists, is secreted somewhere in his stuck up thighs, acute enough merely to enable him to discern noises approaching him from behind; so that with a sudden jerk of these his auditory members he can fling himself out of their danger; but of uttering or appreciating melodies he has no idea. Instead of soaring aloft among the tree tops, his highest efforts can throw him only on the topmost rails of fences. To think of denoting by such a name the distinguished Athenian vocalist! Yet the English translators of Greek and Latin authors seldom bestow on him any other appellation. Of course, in the ode above extracted from, Cowper, among the tuneful grasshoppers mentioned, means to include our little Attic warbler. Not to dwell, however, on the indignity inflicted on him, in being thus miscalled, the classical translator of this ode, as well as its original composer, was certainly not ignorant of the Grecian legends respecting him. His song on earth, we admit, continues but for a summer; yet should not

these two learned poets, to have done our client justice, made at least some allusion to the many happy thousand years he thereafter spends, in his promoted, improved condition, within the gardens of the Pierides? The cricket, on the other hand, is topical and mortal. Ever merry and untiring he may serenade, night after night, for years, the successive members of the same household; but his song at length must come to an end. Should he even escape all the many casualties to which he is liable, as the scorching of coals, the falling of tongs, or the pouncing of cats upon him, whenever he may venture forth from his salubrious retreat, still his life is not immortal. Even should it be prolonged far beyond the date of man's, it must sometime be brought to a close; if not sooner, at any rate "amid the wreck of matter and the crush" of the falling in of the jambs of his fire-place. These Lares must perish ultimately with the downfall of their chimney corners.

Both the cicada and cricket are to be met with in the United States; but while admiring them for their musical abilities and literary associations we are not disposed to adopt either of them for our national serenader. With Bryant we think it highly improper to call up, amid these virgin solitudes and twittering forests, "the faded fancies of an elder world." To be heard in our trees are enough of musical insects, of equal voices to the cicada's and yet more American and patriotic in their habits and feelings; from which, I have no doubt, in due time, our poets will select their appropriate favorite. Still, in the mean time, I trust I shall not be deemed too officious when I would recommend to their favorable consideration, lest unhappily his merits may be overlooked by them, as a suitable candidate for this high distinction, the modest, shrinking, unpretending, green-coated minstrel called the Katydid. While his notes are somewhat similar and certainly equal in tune, at any rate to my ear, to those of the ancient cicada, he is yet distinguished from the latter by some striking characteristics and differences of his own; all of which qualify him admirably for this selection. In argument he is fully as stiff as was the ancient disputant. The speeches of the old men of Troy reminded Homer of the chirpings of the cicada, and in a like manner, but in an inverted order, the song also of the katydid reminded Thomas Haynes Bayly of the speeches of old men:

"Thou mind'st me of some gentlefolks, old gentlefolks are they,
Thou say'st an undisputed thing in such a solemn way."

This shows that their voices are somewhat akin. From the
VOL. III.—NO. V. 28*

similarity too of their names which were formed, no doubt, at first from the respective sounds of their voices, we may infer the same thing : *Cicada*, *Katydid*, *Tettiges*. On the other hand, between them are appropriate national differences. The ancient Greeks were wholly eastern in their feelings and connections, almost worshippers of the dawn and devoted to their present enjoyments. The cicada, in unison with them, sipped the dew of the morning, and afterwards basked and sang in "the liquid noon," of day, unmindful of to-morrow. We Americans, on the other hand, are altogether western in our habits and associations. While enjoying sufficiently the present we still turn our eyes longingly towards the setting sun. We are more disposed, or at any rate we should be, by our religion to cast our hopes into the future, and contemplate with the eye of faith the brighter realities of another world. The katydid, in sympathy with us, while sufficiently cheerful, is yet more thoughtful in his habits; and he never commences singing until the evening twilight, nor does he tire in his notes until he perceives breaking forth the incipient streaks of a happier dawn. Again, while the voice of the cicada is heard in the Spring and throughout the heat of Summer, the katydid begins not till the evenings are becoming cool again, and he continues his strain till cut off by the frosts of Autumn. He belongs to a later and cooler era in the world's history. The ancient Athenians, it is well known, wore golden images of the cicada, as emblems and ornaments, in their braids of hair knotted on the crowns of their heads. We would, by no means, recommend our countrymen in general to adopt a similar fashion; but would it not be highly proper, when our Government will have appointed a poet laureate, that, half hid among the leaves of his laurels, should be seen lurking every here and there the golden image of a katydid?

Mercersburg, Pa.

W. M. N.

THE NATURE OF THE REFORMATION AND ITS
PREPARATION.

[Translated from the General Introduction of "*Reformatoren vor der Reformation*" by Dr. Ullmann.]

BEFORE entering into an account of some of the more important characters of the fifteenth century whose opinions and conduct tended to produce the Reformation, it is necessary first of all to come to a right understanding of the nature of the *Reformation itself*. For such an understanding is by no means a matter of indifference, because the conception we may have of it exerts an influence upon its historical representation; nor is it by any means a superfluous task, because, in regard to this very point, have been circulated many erroneous opinions as confused in theory as they are pernicious in practise. Both among the enemies of the Reformation and such of its friends whose judgments have been warped by interest in its favor, the opinion is very generally current that the essence of this great religious movement did not consist in a firm adhesion to positive truth, but in a firm opposition to existing errors and abuses. Hence the notion that, inasmuch as errors and abuses exist in every age and place, a reformation may be set in motion at any time and place, as the caprice of men may dictate. It must be borne in mind, however, as a truth of prime importance, that that which deserves the name of Reformation cannot be manufactured or invented by man, and that which can be thus fabricated, merits not this great name. In the highest sense of the term a Reformation is always the last result of powerful tendencies previously at work in the course of history, the vigorous outburst of a spiritual process which displays its energetic presence in the movements of centuries. It is the last result of a pressing necessity which lays hold on the deepest wants of an age and attaches every thing to its course with irresistible power;—a necessity which, though it allows room for the free play of personal action and manifests its nature through the agency of representative men, roots itself in the fertile soil of a general mind which permeates the structure of the social system and struggles to expose its desires and thoughts. As a Reformation cannot spring forth full-grown from the brain of a single man, so, too, this common aspiration after it cannot be excited by the action of the self-willed enthusiast, it is the offspring of a violent hungering after spiritual manna, grows in strength as

spiritual famine sharpens the appetite for the food of spiritual life, and comes to maturity by the force of its own internal energy. In the nature of such a continuous spiritual process will be lodged an animating principle, a positive substance, for something merely negative, as scepticism, the rejection of an existing order or mere opposition to it, cannot of itself unite men and put them at variance for centuries. Neither in the physical nor in the moral world, is it possible for anything to assume an organic and permanent form unless there be at hand a germ full of living powers which has in it potentially, in a latent form, that which comes to view when it is fully matured. This germ, too, always contains a positive energy, inasmuch as it first unfolds its own peculiar character and then, in order to gain full scope for uninterrupted growth, comes into collision with that which is alien to it and clears away every element which might check its progress. This general law we also observe in every occurrence which, in the sphere of religion, may be justly and pertinently called a Reformation. A Reformation is reconstruction, a restoration of life. In this definition, however, are included three essential items. In the first place, it is a return to something already given to man, to some original fact. For the Reformation, which must be distinguished from the establishment of religion and the founding of the primitive Church, does not design to call into being something absolutely new and previously unknown, but aims at the renovation of something already established. It confines its operations, then, within the bounds of a given historical domain and, in the moment of encroachment upon territory lying beyond, loses its character altogether. In the second place, it is not merely a return to the original element of christianity, an acknowledgement of it and an earnest aspiration after it, but above all, a hearty, energetic restoration of it and a successful reduction to practical life of that which is thus confessed to be genuine in the christian system. Herein, particularly, consists its practical; positive nature. It is a great historical fact which, as it rests upon a given basis clearly apprehended and confessed by the general consciousness, in turn lays the foundation for a fresh, more perfect growth of the religious spirit. Finally, the nature of the Reformation requires that it should combat the false and abolish the obsolete and that the positive element should assume an offensive attitude. For the very fact that it is to effect the revival of an original power implies that this last has been disfigured and adulterated and that the perversions of it must be rectified. Moreover, in order to secure ample opportunities for the workings of its renewing pow-

er, it must seek to abolish the obsolete institutions which only serve to interrupt its course. But a Reformation, if it be of the right character, is never a mere demolition of any existing state, but a reconstruction which unavoidably destroys the useless and unnecessary.

That these characteristics which belong to the nature of the Reformation, come to light in the ecclesiastical renovation of the sixteenth century no one will deny. It is a going back with clear consciousness to the original element of christianity and moves, in its essential forms, in the christian sphere. By means of a series of magnificent acts and in accordance with the extent of its knowledge, it reduces to actual practise this original element and, in order to acquire room for freedom of action, rejects firmly and energetically every thing alien to it. But that it should assume the character of a world-historical act in which the most accomplished nations of Europe, namely, the earnest, profound and energetic nations of German origin, and within their borders, all orders, the princes and nobles, the learned and artists, the citizens and farmers should participate, that it should become an act which forms the turning point of history from the Mediaeval to the Modern period and the central power to this very day of all progress in the spiritual world;—is not conceivable except as we take into account many pre-existing circumstances. An event of such universal influence must have, like the gigantic oak, deep, wide-spread roots, and a firm foundation out of which it has sprung. In such a case, it is a sure sign of a paltry insight into the interior sense of history to explain its rise and progress by referring them either to personal motives or transient interests. Such circumstances, indeed, are not to be overlooked, but the truly great, the general, the lasting in history proceeds from causes more profound. Persons do not manufacture it; they are its servants and become themselves really great when they occupy this subordinate position with conscious conviction and fixed purpose of will; their greatness increases precisely in proportion as they yield themselves voluntary instruments for bringing to pass the ends of history.

Ere a Reformation can take place, three conditions must be at hand: in the department to be reformed, a corruption must really exist; the necessity for the removal of it must be generally felt and consciously acknowledged; and the foundations of the new order which is to supersede the old, must have been previously laid. It is only when these conditions are present that a period for reformatory proceedings dawns upon the world. And it is only in such a period—not in a time which may seem to suit

the fancy of any one—that true Reformers can make their appearance. For it is only in the presence of such conditions that their labors can be crowned with triumphant success.

To prove that in the course of centuries prior to the ecclesiastical renovation in Germany and Switzerland a corruption of christian doctrine and life had extensively prevailed, might furnish matter enough to fill a whole volume. We will state its main features in general outline. Christianity entered into human nature as the principle of a new life, as a fresh creative spirit which, in the course of historical development, should penetrate and regenerate the nations. It dwelt at first in the internal man and existed in the form of a firm and all-conquering conviction of a communion with a gracious God restored by the Saviour, and of a life of love and the freest morality which sprang from this conviction and a lively faith. This internal spirit of faith, if it was destined to escape dissolution, to exist as a permanent power in the human race and to survive the storms of ages, must necessarily, as is demanded by the very nature of a creative faith, construct a body for its habitation. The body of the spirit implanted into humanity by Christ is the Church. The Church necessarily originated from the nature of christianity which impels to the formation of a community and was of indispensable service in fulfilling its world-embracing mission as prescribed by its Author himself and the great Apostle of the Gentiles. But there is no possibility of a Church without an outward substratum, without a fixed form of doctrine, of worship, and of government. Of all these the Gospel contained the principles, the germs, but not the detailed forms and definitions. These last it was intended should be the free production of humanity enlightened and penetrated by the spirit of christianity. In the nature of the case, it was necessary that, in the forming of an ecclesiastical body, men should enlist in the service of the christian revelation certain portions of what was already at hand in the Jewish and Heathen civilization, religious, scientific, and political. In this way originated a form of doctrine modified by the influence particularly of heathen culture; of worship and government, by an assimilation particularly of Jewish forms of church fellowship. This was a process in accordance with the state of things, and, indeed, wholly unobjectionable whilst material analogous to the christian system was used in the formation of the several parts of the christian communion and whilst the animating spirit of the latter was strong enough to rule and vivify a body constructed in such style. But a period arrived in which such was not the case. By an inter-

mixture and interchange of the principles of the Old and New Testament dispensations and a certain preponderance of heathen philosophy, uncongenial elements were introduced. With the elevation of Christianity to the Imperial throne the great mass of heathens were taken into the Church. Now it was impossible to stem the mighty influx of Pagan elements. There was formed a body of the Church over which the spirit of the Gospel exerted not exclusive control.

This is evidenced by a consideration of the three radical parts which constitute the ecclesiastical life, doctrine, government and Cultus. In the department of doctrine, the influence of Hellenic philosophy and of the heathen mode of thought in general converted a large portion of Christianity, which is religion, into Metaphysics and speculation and substituted for the doctrine of salvation through Christ that of righteousness by works; of government, the interchange of the Old and New Testament standpoint threw reproach on the primitive idea of the universal priesthood of Christians and put in a prominent position the necessity of a special priesthood; of worship, which is closely connected with this interchange because the priest, it was said, must also have a real offering to present, the simple, devout service and love-feast of the first christians was supplanted by that form of the Lord's Supper which treated it as a continually repeated offering of the God-man who was supposed to be spiritually and bodily present. In the Eastern Church we first discover the transplantation of christianity from the sphere of religion to that of Metaphysics and speculation, accompanied at the same time with a disregard of its practical character. This tendency, however, continued its course, with the addition of new elements, in the scholasticism of the West which at first served to call forth fresh energy and gigantic productions, but gradually engendered such extreme formalism that it became necessary either to combat it with sturdy opposition or to allow christianity to be stripped of its living power and converted into an abstract doctrine, to be withdrawn from the congregation and imprisoned in the schools. The conversion of the Gospel of grace into a doctrine of salvation by outward actions appears in its ripest form in the Pelagianism of the Western Church. Though publicly condemned by the Church, it grew luxuriantly and gave rise to manifold corruptions both in the East where its roots had acquired bulk and extension by age, and in the West where monasticism and scholasticism fought its battles. From its operation in the occident proceeded the notion of the meritoriousness of moral works, the dogma of the treasure of merits, the

entire system of indulgences, and the decline of monkery. Its chief influence, however, comes to light in the fact that it changed the Gospel into a system of law, of precepts which concerned not only the Jews but had reference to all nations. The rise of a separate priesthood regarded as being in itself holy and divine which flourished in the West, wrought a thorough change in the spiritual relation of christians to God and the Saviour, and originated the entire system of the Hierarchy and of the Papacy which now took the place of the original equality that obtained between the christian congregations. Finally, the idea of a sacrifice in the administration of the Lord's Supper became the centre of that mysterious and splendid cultus which, so long as there existed a living consciousness of its meaning, powerfully excited and overawed susceptible dispositions. In no long time, however, it degenerated into empty formalism, suppressed the worship of the spirit and of the heart, and thrust into the background the doctrine of salvation which is absolutely essential to the integrity of the christian system.

Christianity in this form offered its presents to the Germanic nations which could perceive in it no perversion of the original because they knew of no other system. Still, along with this shell they obtained the kernel of the Gospel; and it may be affirmed that, in the case of these untutored, unpolished nations, a training like that effected by the hierarchy was absolutely necessary, which curbed their self will by its rigid law, excited their religious susceptibilities by a rich, symbolic worship, and filled their souls with the presentiment of celestial mysteries. Accordingly, they not only progressed under the tuition of this system but unfolded it to its richest bloom. The Hierarchy, the Papacy, Scholasticism, the Cultus so beautifully decorated with the most magnificent imagery, matured their best fruits among these people. At the same time, however, deep in their constitution had been implanted a principle of opposition to the Papacy which demonstrated its presence by turning men's thoughts inwardly upon the movements of their consciousness, by inducing a feeling of spiritual freedom and independence. This principle is intimately connected with the original character of christianity and cannot be separated from it. It may be said, indeed, that these nations were predestined for christianity and christianity for them; they seem to have been foreordained to develop most energetically and fully the christian spirit. On this account it might easily happen that, having attained to a higher and more independent state of culture and to a knowledge of the original essence of the christian revelation, they would stir up

opposition to a system of thought and action which tied christianity to the mere performance of ceremonial duties, converted it into an unbending dogmatism and an outward rule, and sanctioned the abuses of sacerdotal tyranny. It is not meant that Europe generally took no part in this reaction against the Hierarchy; it is simply affirmed that the honor of giving it birth clearly belongs to the Germanic people, for the final decision was announced in Germany, and Luther, who of all Germans best represents the German character, stood at the head of this christian and national movement.

Ere such an event, however, could make its appearance, a historical process continuing through centuries and designed to prepare men for its reception, was necessary. Defects and perversions of the christian system were extant, but the case required that they should be acknowledged and felt as such. Such a state of mind, however, is not produced suddenly and by a single agency, but gradually and by the combined operation of several different forces. The Church is an organism of very complicated structure; it has an inward and an outward being, it embraces, under various relations which act and re-act upon one another, doctrine, life, government and worship. All this, it is true, proceeds from and is determined by some central power, which is the ruling spirit of the Church, in such a way that when the spirit labors under disease, its varied manifestations of religious life are unsound and when the spirit suffers, the outward form of the Church exhibits symptoms of disease more or less fatal. Yet, to fathom the inmost depths of the ecclesiastical spirit and from thence to estimate phenomena, is a privilege granted only to the keen-eyed, practised thinker; whilst those who never go beyond the surface of things, will never go beyond the externals of ecclesiastical life. For this reason the opposition was first directed against the external, only gradually against the internal, and at last against the general corruption that reigned in the Church. The external which immediately excites the senses is the *Cultus*. Accordingly, we find that single men and small parties who strongly insisted on an inward holy worship of God, the baptism of the Spirit, the prayer of the heart, the practical in christianity, first waged war against the continual increase of ceremonies and ecclesiastical pomp and the false overvaluation of good works, with a zeal which sprang from laudable motives but was often accompanied with wild fanaticism. In the 11th century already we find several small sects of this description in France and Germany which the Church condemned as Manicheans. Of these the Petrobru-

sians and Henricians deserve special mention because of their great zeal and radical character. But the style of Cultus then extant rooted itself in the hierarchical government of the Church, and as the Papacy in this period increased in power and uttered its threats with firmer voice, it came to pass by necessity that the war which was carried on against the style of worship, would be waged also against the dominant hierarchy and the general state of the Church. Of this tendency Arnold of Brescia, the Albigenses, and in parts the Stedinger of Germany, were the representatives. But the Hierarchy again directed attention to the general condition of the christian life, for its existence in such connection could be possible only in an age in which christianity had departed from its original tendency and vocation. Attempts were now made to lead the christian life back to its primitive purity, to the simplicity and glory of the Apostolic age. The Apostolic practise became the watchword of the parties which were dissatisfied with the Church. A peculiar order of Brothers of the Apostles was instituted. To the Waldenses belongs the honor of having developed with great success this tendency in its purest forms. In the very moment men turned their eyes back to the Apostolical they planted themselves on the authority of the Scriptures which had hitherto been kept in the dark and elevated it to the rank of the rule of Faith. Such was the case with the Waldenses and with all those who were in search of a piety more profound and earnest than generally obtained. In the course of time this appeal to the Bible as the final tribunal brought men into direct conflict with the dominant doctrine. This contradiction to the existing faith constituted the very gist of the opposition. Now it happened that the spirit of discontent left the ranks of the people within which it had hitherto been confined, and took hold of the higher orders, of theologians and the literati whose special business it was to search the scriptures and complete the doctrinal scheme. Now appeared men like Wicliff, Huss, Jerome of Prague, and several French theologians of distinction. The chief merit of these men who began their actions from the very centre of the spirit and of doctrine, consists in their having regard not only to single abuses but to the corrupt state of the whole Church, in their referring the cause of this corruption not to mere external circumstances and particular abuses but to the general spiritual decay of the whole Church, in their uniting in fair harmony well regulated zeal with accurate knowledge.

The spirit of opposition having, after the lapse of four hundred years, assailed the corruptions of the Church from all sides

and penetrated all classes, the lowest as well as the highest, the ignorant as well as the learned, and having failed to induce the enactment of ordinances for the improvement of the Church, a part of whose clergy sank more hopelessly into the abyss of vice, it came to pass by necessity that the desire for a Reformation became a matter of public concern, a popular interest in the fullest sense of the term, that the great Councils of the West, in the face of all Europe, and with special earnestness and zeal, legislated upon the subject, that the Imperial Diets continued to insist with increased importunity on a consideration of this point and that the whole of Europe resounded in every nook and corner with clamors for an improvement of morals. Such was notoriously the condition of things. A fact of this order must have sprung from solid causes. It cannot be doubted that a necessity for a Reformation, deeply rooted and generally acknowledged, was at hand. The negative condition for the appearance of such an event, had been fulfilled.

But something more of greater account was necessary ; a positive element which consisted in the incipient presence of the fundamental principles of that which was effected by the Reformation. It was requisite that the spirit which was to be poured afresh upon the world by means of the Reformation should have displayed its power in individuals and smaller corporations, and that the purer conception of the christian faith which was to reconstruct after the primitive pattern the christian life should have evinced its efficiency in living manifestations out of which, if not in an outward yet in an inward connection, the theology of the Reformation might proceed. Now, this positive element was also at hand. That which constitutes the peculiar feature in the convictions and tendencies of the Reformers, although they possessed it in an original form and as an integral portion of their own spiritual life, was not something absolutely new ; for the radical elements of it were included in the nobler spirit of the age and had been already developed, to a great extent, by several conspicuous personages. It was the special vocation of the Reformers clearly and convincingly to arrange these elements in their proper relation to the governing influence of a living faith, to reduce to actual practise what had previously been a mere wish and feeling, and to make the better theology of single men the foundation for the confirmation of a large communion.

We may regard, as the fundamental element of the Reformation which includes all its other characteristics, the firm conviction that salvation comes not from man but from God. The leading object of the Reformers was to prostrate before God and

Christ everything human, no matter how venerable its antiquity or how lofty its position in the Church, to give all honor to God and the Saviour, to separate from the christian faith and life everything which seemed to conflict with the honor of God and His word, and to restore the proper relation between man and his Maker by making Christ the only Mediator. This tendency, in the sphere both of christian doctrine and life, we find at work among the forerunners of the Reformation, so that through them was already present the material as well as formal principle of that great movement. That which these men brought to a clearer and more general acknowledgment is, on the one hand, the necessity of going back to the Scriptures as the pure word of God in opposition to human teachings and human traditions and of constructing in a purer, more evangelical form the christian faith and life in detail upon the basis of Scripture rightly interpreted and of the practise of the Apostolic Church rightly copied; on the other hand, the firm conviction that perfect peace with God and true happiness could not spring from any human activity or works prescribed by the Church, but from Divine grace revealed in Christ and received by an energetic faith, that the nearest and only safe way to God was not the Church and her prescriptions which were heavily laden with human additions, but Christ, the Redeemer and Mediator, and His Spirit which maketh free and leadeth into all truth and holiness.

We discover, as was to be expected, in their forerunners the same peculiarities which marked the Reformers themselves. They did not exhibit, it is true, the same fullness, symmetry and harmony of character, but, as precursors, they possessed these characteristics in an inferior degree. From this point of view, they may be divided into two classes. In the case of the Reformers, particularly of those whose influence was universally felt, we find a perfect union and intermixture of conviction and action, of theological thought and ecclesiastical practise. So, too, in regard to their forerunners, but in an inferior degree and with the difference that with some predominated practical activity in behalf of the Church, with others theological investigation; the former, among whom may be numbered Huss, Jerome of Prague and Savonarola, exerted a more wide spread influence on the great mass and, in their opposition to the dominant power, were often disposed to fly away from its control, whilst the latter, such as John of Goch, John of Wesel and John Wessel, exerted a greater influence in a theological respect by their profound speculations and retired within the precincts of their own spirits. As regards this last mentioned class, another

difference obtains. With the Reformers the positive and negative elements were combined in fair proportions. So, too, in regard to their forerunners, but in such a way that with some of them, as John von Goch, the positive predominated, with others, as John von Wesel, the polemic, whilst in John Wessel the two were united in the greatest uniformity. Finally, we may make another distinction. That which in the Reformation stood opposed to the scholastic period, was a living Scriptural theology. This was obtained in two ways, either scientifically or practically, in the school of speculation or experience. The one was prepared negatively by opposing and abolishing scholasticism, positively by the revival of the study of the ancient languages and literature and by the re-establishment of a theological system not based upon the tradition of the Church and Schools but upon the pure foundation of the Bible; the other was prepared by the purer, more practical mysticism and by religious incitements among all classes, particularly among the people, which proceeded from the use of the Scriptures. Thus we can divide the forerunners of the Reformation into those who stimulated the people to action, as Gerhard Groot and the brothers of the Common Life, into practico-mystical, as Thomas A'Kempis, learned and philological, as Agricola, Reuchlin and Erasmus, and theological, as John von Goch and John Wessel.

Mercersburg, Pa.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

[An extract from Thiersch's Lectures.]

THE holy Eucharist differs in this from all other sacraments, in the Catholic system, that it is taken to be not only a sacrament, but at the same time also a sacrifice and in this view a real propitiation for the sins of the living and the dead. In comparing the Catholic doctrine with our own then, it must be considered under such twofold aspect, first as a *sacrament* and afterwards as a *sacrifice*.

Taking it up now in the first view, we feel here more than anywhere besides the need of understanding fairly, at the outset, what is to be regarded as the actual Protestant doctrine. This requires us unavoidably to say something of the difference, which rent Protestantism within the first ten years of its history into two churches.

No regard will be had in the case, however, to what has been thought and spoken on the subject of this controversy by certain modern theologians, who let us know more or less plainly that they do not pretend to be governed in their judgment simply by the Bible, or to interpret it with believing submission from itself only and not from a foreign source. From such Protestantism no salvation is to be expected for the cause to which it belongs, and it can have no part, remaining what it now is, in the church of the future. This will know and feel, in proportion precisely to its new experience of the operations and gifts of the Holy Ghost, that it is called to honor in the solemnity of the eucharist a most sacred and unfathomable mystery of Divine love, and that all which pious church teachers of past times have said to magnify it falls short still of the wonders of grace it actually contains.

Looking at our Protestant theology as it now stands, we may say that already all those theologians who profess faith in the real incarnation of the true God in Christ, and submit themselves to the declarations of the Holy Scriptures as infallible oracles of divine wisdom, are more and more agreed in this: That *Zwingli* and *Oecolampadius* went too far, when they found in the Lord's supper *only* a monumental meal, and in the use of it a mere practical demonstration of faith before men; that all those have erred, and do still err, who affirm that the believer receives in the eucharist nothing more than what he has also and may have without it. The necessity of acknowledging a mystery in the sacrament, has become clear for many later theologians particular-

ly from our Lord's discourse in the sixth chapter of John ; where the language is so very strong, that all attempts to resolve it into a figurative or simply spiritualistic sense must be turned by it into confusion. The union with Christ which he there promises to his followers, is just the object itself which the eucharist was instituted afterwards to secure.

We may rid ourselves of Zuingli's view, however, without falling in with the harsh judgments that are again pronounced against this reformer in our own time from the Lutheran side. We know that he was carried into an extreme with his doctrine, through opposition to the Catholic doctrine and practice as they then stood. He proposed to destroy at once the basis of all that appeared to him an abuse in the sacrifice of the mass and its applications, by denying the actual presence of Christ in the Lord's supper. His error, and that of his followers, stood in this, that they supposed it possible *only* in such way to avoid the abuses, which notoriously prevailed in the church at that time. This consideration does not serve to conceal the error of the view in question ; but it so explains it, that while we acknowledge it on the one side to be wrong, we must feel ourselves bound on the other to exercise a becoming indulgence towards the men who first brought it forward.

Calvin struck out a middle view between the Lutheran and Zuinglian, which enabled him first to fall in with the Wittenberg Concord, and then again to unite with the Zuinglian interest in the Consensus Tigurinus. Merely to comprehend his theory, and to state it fairly, is by no means an easy task ; while a just critical estimate of its actual sense may be said to belong to the very hardest problems of theology. When Calvin's doctrine, without opposition at least from *Melancthon*, crept in among the followers of this last in Wittenberg, and led thus to the mighty reaction that followed on the side of strict Lutheranism, the three propositions which became the shibboleth of Lutheran orthodoxy were : the "communication of attributes real and not simply verbal"—an "oral manducation"—and the "manducation of the ungodly." The first of these three propositions, relating to the doctrine of Christ's Person, falls not now in our way ; the second and third define the distinction between the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's supper and the Calvinistic. As regards now the proposition that unbelievers also receive the Lord's body, there should be no confessional controversy about it ; for it refers to a question, that has no right properly to be presented in the Christian Church. Our Lord did not institute his supper for unbelievers, and their participation in it

is an abnormity, that came not forward in the apostolical age, and is therefore not referred to at all in the New Testament. The apostle speaks indeed of such as partake of the mystery unworthily; they "eat and drink judgment to themselves," by not discerning "the Lord's body." But those unworthy communicants are there not ungodly, not unbelieving. They are believers, who have not made proper preparation. These receive actually the Lord's body; and so much therefore the passage at all events means, that this body is objectively present independently of the communicant's mind, and is received also along with the bread independently of the amount greater or less of his faith and preparation.

But if it be asked now: Is this participation by the mouth? it is necessary to put aside first some misunderstandings, between those who answer *Yes*, and those who answer *No*. It is saying too little, when the Reformed theologians speak of a *cibus mentis* or mental food; since this looks too easily and onesidedly to an activity of reflection, and a presence for memory or at best for the imagination. The right expression has been hit upon here by those Lutheran divines, who require that the body of the Lord shall be owned for a *cibus novi hominis*, an aliment of the new man. For the biblical conception of the "new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness," (not to be confounded with the "inner man,") is so deep and comprehensive, that the nourishment of it carries in it a reference of itself also to the future glorification of our bodies. Only then, and in such form, shall we be new men in the whole, made complete as sons of God and set in the full possession of eternal life. The glorification of the body however, or the resurrection to life, is nothing else than a transformation into the likeness of the glorious body of Christ. But now the sure pledge of our glorification, according to the doctrine of the old church which has its ground also in the New Testament, is given in the holy supper. Here we come upon something, which Calvin seeks indeed to reach, but does not fully reach in fact. An excellent and truly enlightened theologian of the present time has well remarked, that nothing is to be asked of the Reformed church, but that she acknowledge in truth the glorification of Christ's body.

In return however, we must also allow, that every doctrine is false which pretends to place the Lord's body in one category with common objects of sense, and so to fix its presence under definite and circumscriptive local dimensions. The holding of the mystery in this way, will be found in truth to overthrow

again both the mystery itself and the glorification of Christ's body.

We are fully convinced, that Christian theology must make up its mind to the unreserved acknowledgment of an objective mystery in the Christian worship. The words used in the institution of the Lord's supper, taken in connection with the general doctrine of the New Testament, are too powerful a testimony here to be disputed. Those who deny it have allowed themselves to be led in part into the sore blunder, of substituting for the Saviour's mystical language, in the distribution of the sacrament, some other form of speech; either, "This is the communion of the body of Christ," or, "Thy faith in the body of Christ, which was delivered up to death, strengthen thee unto eternal life." This however should be as little tolerated, as a change of the formula of baptism. But the proceeding betrays an uncomfortable shyness in regard to our Lord's words, and rests no doubt on some apprehension that the utterance of them, at so sacred a moment, might still call up again the idea of a real mystery.

Altogether then we have a right to bring no other doctrine here into view as Protestant, in contrast with the Catholic, but that of a true real presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament of the altar, of a presence which depends, not on the faith first that we bring along with us, but on the Redeemer's own institution and promise.

In the Catholic church, this doctrine, founded on the Scriptures and ancient tradition, has grown into the dogma of transubstantiation; and what we have to do now is: first, to place transubstantiation, in itself considered, in comparison with the doctrine of the real presence; secondly, to try the consequences that have been deduced from this Roman dogma, the adoration of the host namely and communion in one kind.

The difference between the doctrine of a real presence, with which the earthly elements retain their substance, and the doctrine of transubstantiation, is not so great as is sometimes supposed. That both come very near together; no one has more clearly proclaimed than Luther; we may say indeed, Luther considered the doctrines to be so related that they might well enough stand both together in the church.

This insight into the smallness of the difference between the two doctrines, may be gained in two ways. First, by considering how gradually and quietly the old christian doctrine passed over into the idea of a change of substance; and then, secondly, by comparing this last in its finished scholastic form with the

Lutheran doctrine. It is hazardous, to aim at finding with full definiteness in antiquity, any one of the modern confessional views. Attempts of this sort lead only too easily to an unhistorical judgment. A strict historical and philological analysis of the patristic doctrine shows rather, that this does not move exactly in the track of any of these later systems. It has its own peculiarities, and must be understood and expounded from itself. It is only a very few points out of this rich subject, that we can allow ourselves to touch upon here.¹

The most learned instructive treatises on the question, whether antiquity favors the Catholic or the Reformed type of doctrine, are those which came out in France and the Netherlands during the seventeenth century. In looking back to these discussions, we must say with *J. A. Ernesti* (in his *Antimuratori*), that neither of the two parties was able to set antiquity in full unforced harmony with their doctrine. The fathers will not fit themselves to the Reformed scheme, and the oldest of them refuse also to go fully with the Catholic. Very distinct doctrinal expositions occur particularly with these writers, who in the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies have defended the one person in two natures and the two natures in one person. They place the mystery of the eucharist in parallel with this dogma; and this, so as to illustrate the integrity of the two natures in Christ, by the conjunction of the earthly and heavenly elements in the sacrament. Here the heavenly element has not yet come to preponderate so completely over the earthly, as in the doctrine which affirms a change of the earthly substance into the heavenly. And yet this last grew very simply, without any spring and by a sort of natural continuity of thought, out of the other, which also it never wholly supplanted in the church. In its scholastic completion, the tenet of transubstantiation separates

¹ It is affirmed in the later manuals of Dogmatic History, since the time of Semler, that the oldest fathers overlooked, in the doctrine of the Lord's supper, the inseparable union of the divine Logos with the human nature, and assumed that the Logos enters into a union with the elements of bread and wine analogous with the incarnation, so that no reference was had whatever to the presence of the body that suffered, and of the blood that was shed, for our sins. I pronounce this whole representation to be utterly false. It is made up of pure misconceptions, and deserves here no farther respect. For its full refutation, as a deceitful tradition which ascribes to antiquity a doctrine, that would destroy the whole connection of the ancient christian faith, and that would annihilate in particular the most sacred article of this faith, the mystery of the incarnation, I may refer to my article on the Doctrine of Irenæus with regard to the Eucharist, published in Rudelbach's *Journal for Lutheran Theology* for the year 1841.

between the substance and its accidents; while the first is wholly changed, the last remain. The question however, What belongs to the accidents and what is to be counted as the substance of the bread and wine? is a mere school question, and let it be answered one way or another, the answer cannot with propriety be made an article of faith. In the explanation of what is to be included among accidents, particular Catholic theologians go so far, that one can scarcely see more how to distinguish their view in substance from the Lutheran, which stands to the simple proposition, that notwithstanding the real presence bread and wine remain what they are. We find that church fathers like Irenaeus always look upon the consecrated bread and wine as still a corporal food, which for unprejudiced thinking implies certainly that the substance of them is not changed. But the Catholics set themselves right with all such representations, by reminding us that the virtue bread and wine have to nourish and strengthen the body is to be reckoned also among their accidents, in which view we have no right to think of transubstantiation as destroying any such property in the elements. When it once comes to this however, transubstantiation in itself considered (without regard to its consequences) can no longer be distinguished for the standpoint of faith from the real presence, and any deviation there may be in it from the sense of the Scriptures, to him who finds this presence in the Scriptures, will not seem to be of any serious account. This feeling has been openly expressed also once and again, in times following the Reformation, by Catholic as well as Lutheran divines. If there is any one among the last who deserves to be named as authority in exegetical matters, it will be allowed to be J. A. Bengel. This pious scholar declares, in one of his letters published by Burk, that he would much sooner undertake to prove transubstantiation from the Scriptures, than that view which acknowledges no real presence of Christ's body.

The difference between the Catholic and Lutheran doctrines would be indeed great, if the first pretended to say that the host is changed into a corresponding part of the Saviour's body, and so the wine also into a part of his blood. That apprehensions of this sort, bringing down the mystery into the sphere of common local existence and making it thus a phenomenon of sense, are actually at hand in the Catholic church, may be gathered from the exceptional cases, in which the show of the earthly accidents is reported as actually disappearing at times, so as to allow the sacred blood to be seen as such in the cup. The Catholic church would do well not to require faith in miracles.

of this sort; since it is associated with conceptions, that contradict her own better doctrine. For this supposes the glorification of Christ's body, and affirms its presence only, under such exalted form, laying particular stress on the thought that the whole Christ, *totus et integer Christus*, is present under each of the two kinds (Conc. Trid. Sess. XIII, cap. 3, comp. *ibid.* canon 3).^{*} This doctrine is far removed from every Capernaitic view, and only in contradiction to it can any one encourage those miracles of the popular belief, or employ them as proofs for transubstantiation. We only see here again however, how the practice of this church departs from its theory, and perverts truths which this apprehends in a right way; and so long as the case remains thus, it is not to be expected of course that the doctrine of transubstantiation should find on our side generally that toleration to which as a mere theory it is properly entitled.

The decided stand of the old Protestantism against this doctrine, had regard mainly to the *consequences* that connect themselves with it. While we go on now to consider these, it will be proper to inquire at the same time how far they are right, who tell us that the same consequences, particularly the adoration of the host and the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, flow also from the real presence. This affirmation comes from two different sides; first from the rigidly Reformed, who just to avoid these consequences reject the real presence; and then from the Catholics, who press on the Lutherans the necessity of receiving, along with the real presence, the whole doctrine of which they take it to be a part. Among those who present the matter under this last view, Bossuet above all deserves to be named, on account especially of what he has written on the subject in his *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches*. (Comp. the sixth book §§. 20-42.)

According to the Catholic doctrine, the change takes place at the moment of consecration and in virtue of it. It exists independently of the distribution and participation of the supper; even after the completion of the whole solemnity, the host still remains the body of the Lord. This conception of a change subsisting for itself and fully independent of use, was carried

^{*} Every Capernaitic conception is already shut out by this, that according to the inviolably settled expression it must be believed: in sanctissimo eucharistiae sacramento contineri vere, realiter et substantialiter, corpus et sanguinem una cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ac proinde totum Christum.—Sess. XIII, can. I. In every Catholic Catechism, this is taught with the same words.

out by the theologians of the middle ages with the strictest consequence, which did not shrink even, as is known, from raising and in part at least affirming the revolting question: *an etiam a brutis animalibus sumatur corpus Christi?*

The first consequence of the view which takes the presence of Christ to be bound to the consecrated host, is the adoration of the host, not only in the moment of consecration or distribution, but also afterwards, when it is preserved and exhibited in the church for worship, or is carried to a sick person, or is borne in procession as on the festival of *corpus-Christi*.

These consequences Protestantism avoids, by referring the Saviour's promise, on which rests the belief of his presence, only to the dispensation and reception of the sacrament. For only for this end, and no other, was the ordinance instituted.

This Protestant doctrine then is commonly so fixed, as to admit the real presence only in the moment of participation. We find it so taken precisely by those Lutheran theologians of the present time, who on this ground lay down the rule that the christian should kneel in the moment of taking the communion, but in this moment alone.

We find nearly the same view already among the Waldensians. The proposition among others is ascribed to them: *quod conversio*—this they still held—*non fiat in manu sacerdotis sed in ore sumentis*. In the Calvinistic theory it follows of itself of course, that the presence which it acknowledges is linked to the moment of participation, with which the subjective ascent of the communicant to heaven and his spiritual union with Christ are taken to coincide. But this limitation is not so of course on the Lutheran standpoint. It is thus definitely uttered by Melancthon only; never, to my knowledge, by Luther. It does not fit by any means the connection of the strict Lutheran view. This proceeds, and as I believe correctly, on the idea that the real presence has place in consequence of the administration of the sacrament in conformity with its institution. The one essential part of this administration is taken to be the consecration. Through this the promise of Christ, given once for all, assumes its special application to the elements in hand. The consecration takes place with the words of our Lord: "This is—not, This shall be—my body." Nothing is more natural, when we set out with these premises, than to assume that now the consecration at once also, according to the sound of the words, goes into effect, and is not a mere pre-intimation of what is to become true afterwards in the moment of distribution. This last restriction, to my mind at least, appears exceedingly arbitrary. If we

assume that the promise and the consecration are the efficient cause of the reality of the sacrament, and so far as I can see Luther does assume this, there is no reason at hand for disjoining the effect in time from the cause, and transposing it to a later moment. Luther retained for some time the elevation in connection with the act of blessing. But what meaning could this have for the people, if not to remind them that in virtue of the consecration Christ was already present?

I will not rest here in a mere historical observation. It is my own conviction, that we should put away, in the celebration of the mystery, this arbitrary restriction of it to the moment of distribution. When any of the wine is carelessly spilt, or when at the close of the solemnity what is left of the consecrated elements is allowed to go to common use, it gives the Catholics heavy and it seems to me just offence. It was not permitted to turn any part that was left of the paschal lamb, at the close of the festival, to common use; what remained must be burnt with fire during the same holy night. We also are bound—not to worship what is thus left—but still to preserve it from every sort of desecration.

According to Lutheran and Anglican rite, the christian kneels when he receives the sacrament. The Lutheran doctrine allows, that this signifies an adoration of the present Christ. Against the proposition of the Catholic church that Christ is to be worshipped in the eucharist, I would not know what to object if it had merely this meaning, that in the solemnity of the eucharist we should pray to him as there present. And to restrict this worship to the moment of the distribution of the sacrament, repressing it in the interval between the consecration and the distribution, is something to my judgment and to my feeling wholly without reason. The adoration at the moment of consecration is an observance of the ancient church, as we may learn from Chrysostom. To this observance I find nothing to object.

In taking the ground that the Protestant service might and should approach the ancient usage, I may seem to have made a very important concession to Catholicism. With so much the greater force apparently may it urge upon us its other consequences.

But from this very standpoint, these may and must be rather refused and disowned. In the first place, Protestantism has the holy scriptures and christian antiquity on its side, when it stands to the principle that our Lord instituted his sacrament for the use of the solemnity of which he gave the example, not that a part of it should be withdrawn from its proper destination, and

kept for worship whether in the church or in public procession. When the church notwithstanding makes such use of the host, it is a liberty not sanctioned by antiquity. True, this was not Protestant here either in its practice. The ancient church knew nothing of a communion for the sick as we now have it, when the minister at the bed of the dying, and in the family circle perhaps, goes through a full celebration of the supper. The ancient usage was rather, as is known, that from the bread consecrated at the public celebration in the church a portion was carried also by the deacons to the sick. Nay, it might be shown that even as early as the third century, the practice prevailed of preserving also a part of the consecrated bread, to be used by the dying in cases of subsequent need. But such preservation is still always for the purpose, not of adoration, but of actual use.

If it be contended now however, that it follows of itself that the host should be honored with worship also in the interval of its preservation, I must deny it. Where religious transactions are in question in regard to which the conscience needs to be well grounded, we are bound to exercise the greatest caution towards ourselves and towards the forms that offer themselves for our devotion, and to keep closely to the bounds that are prescribed to us by the pattern set before us in the scriptures and ecclesiastical antiquity. We can not, and dare not, allow to the church, the right of introducing new modes of worship, however plausible the conclusions on which they are made to rest. The church, in case even she might indulge individuals in any such form of worship, should never make it a law for all nor raise it into a test of orthodoxy.

While we oppose here the requisitions of the Catholic church, it does not follow that we must characterise the adoration of the host, in or out of the mass, as idolatry. We know how commonly this has been done among Protestants. Even the Heidelberg Catechism does not hesitate, to stigmatize the entire mass as "an accursed idolatry." But if I may speak out openly what I think in this matter, I must confess that I would wish to have no part in such invectives. I cannot rid myself of the impression, which was made upon me some time since by the word of one of our great poets: "Woe to him who calls a religious service idolatry, the object of which is Christ"—at least in the mind of the worshipper. One who has ever at all brought home to himself that the Catholic is convinced of the Redeemer's actual presence in what he thus honors, must shrink certainly from representations that identify such worship with heathenism. Just as little may its parallel be found in that less repre-

hensible form of idolatry, which Jeroboam introduced into Israel when he caused molten calves to be set up at Dan and Bethel, that Jehovah the God of Israel might be worshipped through them as images or symbols. Neither is the worship which was afterwards rendered to the brazen serpent, (Nehushtan,) once erected by Moses in the wilderness as a sign of salvation, to be drawn here into comparison. I know but one analogy that we may fairly bring from the Old Testament. Only in the place which the Lord should choose for his name to dwell there, were sacrifices to be offered. So it was commanded in the Mosaic law. Nevertheless the Israelites transgressed this restriction laid upon them by God, nearly at all times down to the first destruction of Jerusalem, and sacrificed not only in Jerusalem or Shiloh, but also on the high places. And this Samuel also did; who notwithstanding was a judge and prophet of the Lord. Although too he observed not the prescribed rule, he was not at once visited with condemnation, but stood under Divine indulgence. So is it also here. The worship of the host, as it has place in the Catholic church, transgresses the right bounds. No one who is better informed should take part in it. No one should be forced to it. Still, those who have not such better knowledge, and suppose themselves to be honoring Christ in this way, are to be regarded as under Divine indulgence.

In the known controversy, how far a Protestant also may participate in the kneeling before the sanctissimum of the Catholic church, two cases, in my opinion, should be distinguished. It is a general christian principle, that the reality and efficacy of a sacrament does not depend on the personal worthiness of the administrator; according to Protestant view he cannot even by a false intention vitiate the reality of the transaction. Hence then the solemnity of the mass must be acknowledged as a true celebration of the Lord's supper, and the presence of Christ in it firmly held. If this be so, a Protestant who sees no ground for restraining this presence to the moment of distribution, may feel himself spontaneously moved to kneel along with the rest at the time of consecration; he may not consider it right to give offence on this point to those with whom he worships. But what might prevent him from such compliance, and so from attendance on the mass altogether, would be the fact, that according to a very widely extended conventional view, kneeling at the mass is taken as a sign of going over to the Roman church or of agreement with its whole system of faith. It is quite another matter however, where Protestants are required to kneel also when the host is carried in procession or borne to the sick.

As a second consequence proceeding from the doctrine of transubstantiation, we turn our attention now to the *communion under one kind* and the *doctrine of concomitance*. Those two points are thus related. The communion of the laity, and of non-officiating priests, under one kind, gained prevalence in the western church first as a custom or usage. Afterwards the scholastic theology sought to justify this usage, as well as all other parts of the existing system. This was done by the proposition, that the whole Christ is present under each of the two kinds, that the presence of his body cannot be thought of without that of his blood and *vice versa*. The use is a matter of discipline. This theory is a matter of doctrine, and was raised into a dogma by the council of Trent. The use may be changed again by the church; the dogma however, by which it is justified, has been irrevocably pronounced.

Isolated cases of a communion under the species of bread alone, are to be found in antiquity. Here belongs the custom, already noticed, of conveying to the sick a portion of the consecrated bread.* Of a communication of the cup, going along with such instances, no trace that I know of is on record. Still these occasions are to be regarded only as cases of necessity. When the cup is withdrawn here and there in the Oriental churches, it is also by such necessary exception, and not as rule and law. Only in the Western church has the withdrawal been raised to any such character, and this too at a time when the opposition to transubstantiation, as urged by Ratramn and Berengarius, was no longer heard. It goes to show the vast distance which had come to hold in the view of the middle ages, between the laity and the priest when officiating at the altar. But still this thought is by no means sufficient, to explain the rise of the usage. It grew mainly, no doubt, out of an extreme fear of profaning the sacred blood. The danger of profanation, by spilling, was much greater in handing the cup, than in the case of the host. Möhler refers the withdrawal of the cup also to a certain diffidence which the laity felt about using what was so

* When in the case of the holy supper thus, what had place originally only as a necessity for the sick came to be in the western church the reigning custom, namely communion under one kind, the fact forms a remarkable historical parallel with the course of things in regard to the rite of baptism. Anciently baptism was administered by aspersion only to the sick (*baptismus clinicorum*), but afterwards this became in the west the reigning mode. The oriental (Greek) church on the other hand has retained, as the communion in both kinds, so also the form of baptism by immersion.

sacred, in view of their own unworthiness; in which view it must be thought of as a voluntary measure on the part of the people themselves, rather than as imposed upon them by priestly pride. This is the most favorable derivation of the usage for the Catholic church, and altogether it is not historically improbable. But when it is brought forward in the way of apology, it should be remembered that such diffidence with regard to using the means of grace which Christ has provided for all believers, is in itself false and wrong. It is the same sort of diffidence, that led many in the ancient church to put off their baptism as long as possible, the same sort of diffidence that hinders the pious Catholic from admitting the witness of adoption which the Holy Ghost works in the consciousness of believers; it is the same humility that leads him to turn to the saints for help, rather than to the Saviour himself. The feeling of unworthiness is in itself good; but in all these cases it is misled, and lacks the illumination that is shed abroad in the heart by full confidence in the Saviour's grace.

Communion under one kind, the source of the great Hussite commotions after the decree of Constance, was an evil which it was confidently trusted would find its remedy from the council held at Trent. On this point, above all, the Protestants wished to have a hearing in the body. The council fell in with this wish. In the thirteenth session (11th Oct. 1551), after all beside, had been settled in relation to the eucharist as a sacrament, the decision of four articles, of which three referred to the withholding of the cup, was deferred till the arrival of the Protestant delegates, for whom also a safe conduct was ordered.* In the fifteenth session (25th Jan. 1552), and still later, after an almost ten years' interruption of the council, on the 4th of March 1562, the safe conduct was renewed. Finally in the twenty-first session (16th July 1562), the four articles were decided fully in the sense of the Catholic tradition, the first three thus against the Protestants. Only these two questions were still left: "Whether the reasons which led to the withdrawal of the cup continue so of force, that the use of it may on no ground be allowed

* These four articles were as follows: 1. An necessarium sit ad salutem, et divino jure praeceptum, ut singuli Christi fideles sub utraque specie ipsius venerabile sacramentum accipiant. (On this it was already decided at Constance, that it is not required to receive in both kinds.) 2. Num minus sumat qui sub altera quam qui sub utraque communicat. 3. An erraverit sancta mater ecclesia, laicos et non celebrantes sacerdotes sub panis tantum specie communicando. 4. An parvuli etiam communicandi sint.

to any?" and secondly: "If in any case there were reasons to allow the cup to a nation or kingdom, whether any, and if so what, particular conditions should go along with the grant?" The determination of both these points was reserved by the council for a later occasion. There was still hope thus, that the wish of the Emperor, Ferdinand I., would be regarded, and a main difficulty in the way of church union be removed. But these expectations also were disappointed, when the body resolved, at the close of its twenty second session (17th Sept. 1562), to leave both questions unsettled, and to refer the whole matter to the Pope:^a *decrevit (S. Synodus) integrum negotium ad sanctissimum dominum nostrum esse referendum,—qui pro sua singulari prudentia id efficiat, quod utile reipublicae Christianae, et salutare petentibus usum calicis fore judicaverit.* To such melancholy conclusion came the whole transaction, which had been regarded with so much expectation.^b

The council pronounced an anathema on any one who should say, that the church was not moved by just grounds and reasons to establish communion only under the species of bread for the laity and non-officiating priests. But what these weighty and good grounds were, was not said. And the fact is, that if anything is not to be justified, it is the pernicious decree of Constance.

The church has changed the institution of Christ, and vindicated this change by theories that belong to the schools, and that can lay the ground for no article of faith. In the sphere of genuine church faith and life, questions like that concerning the concomitance ought not to be brought forward. It is enough here to know, how Christ instituted his supper.

We can allow indeed, nay we must do so after Luther's example, that the Catholic also receives a true eucharist. He finds himself, so long as his church forbids him the cup, in a state of necessity, similar to that of the dying in the ancient church. For that which men withhold from him, the Lord himself, can

^a This *Decretum super petitione concessione calicis* is purposely not placed along with the doctrinal decrees of the twenty second session, but after the *decretum de reformatione*, to intimate that the object of it belongs to the sphere of discipline.

^b The Emperor, who well knew that any permission yet to be obtained from the Pope would not have the favorable effect, that was to be expected from a decision of the Council, said to some prelates who were present when he received information of this decree: "Gentlemen, I have done all that I could to save my people; now look to it in your turn, you who have most at stake in the matter."—Comp. Sarpi, *Hist. du Conc. de Trente*.

secure to him a compensation. But this does not say, that the church, entrusted with the dispensation of the Divine mysteries, has the right to put her members in such necessity. Rather the law, as it still stands, is the heaviest and most just stone of offence. This precisely is the abuse, which as experience teaches brings the purpose of leaving the Catholic church with many to full ripeness, and in truth no other evil in it can well be said to furnish so fair occasion for this step.

So far as I know, the bishops have power in single cases, where the transition of a Catholic to Protestantism may be prevented by this and by no other means, to allow an individual the use of the cup. In the case of the *Maronites* and of the *United Greeks*, Rome allows regularly communion in both kinds, as well as the marriage of priests. The Pope has authority unquestionably to extend both allowances to other nations also, nay to the entire Roman communion. His not having done so since the council of Trent, cannot cut off every hope that a better time may still come. Möhler himself expresses hopes that look this way. It is not indeed christian, but as men now are it is still natural and easy to be explained, that favors are refused to enemies which would be granted to friends. If the Protestants could only assume a more peaceable attitude towards the Catholic church, the desire of the best men on the first side might possibly make an impression on the best men of the other side, which could not be made by the most urgent demands of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. With the present temper of the parties, and the tumultuary conduct of those Catholics who seek the restoration of the cup, there is but small prospect indeed of such a result; only when the relations of the world are brought to such a form, that all Christians may see where they have their true friends and proper allies, will there be room to look for an adjustment also of this difficulty. Till then we must persist, on our side, in a calm but still earnest and firm protest against the withdrawal of the cup.

Translated by J. W. N.

EARLY CHRISTIANITY.

IN an interesting letter of the Rev. Dr. Bacon, written recently from Lyons in France and published in the N. Y. "Independent" and the "American and Foreign Christian Union," we meet with the following passages referring to the present and past religious character of that ancient and venerable city.

"Before I left home I resolved that, if it were possible, I would visit Lyons in my travels, and see for myself what God has wrought there for the revival and advancement of true religion. That city, as you know, is the centre of a great and powerful organization for the propagation of the Roman Catholic faith—an organization second only to the Propaganda at Rome in the extent of its missions and the amount of its resources. In that city, too, the Roman Catholic religion is more flourishing, with the indications of living zeal, and more deeply seated in the affections of the people, than in any other city on the continent of Europe. The fact, then, so often reported to us, that there a Protestant Evangelical Church has been gathered, and that in the midst of such a population evangelical labors have been crowned with signal success, is a fact which the Christian traveler may well turn aside to see."

"Ever since my childhood the name of Lyons has been associated in my thoughts, with the faith and patience of the saints who suffered there as witnesses for CHRIST in the second century. The story of the sufferings and constancy of Pothinus, Blandina, Perpetua, and others, is upon record in the epistle from the Christians of Lyons and Vienne, to their brethren in Asia Minor, with whom they appear to have been closely connected—a document which is familiar to the readers of Milner's Church History, and which is among the earliest and most authentic remains of Christian antiquity. It was an interesting thought that I was now for the first time upon ground that had been consecrated by the struggle of primitive Christianity, and watered with the blood of martyrs, some of whom had looked upon the faces of CHRIST'S immediate followers. And now, among the 200,000 inhabitants of Lyons, are there any living remains of the Gospel for which the primitive martyrs suffered, and which gave them the victory? The archbishop of Lyons and Vienne is honored by the Roman Catholic Church as the successor of Pothinus and St. Irenæus; but how slight the resemblance between the pompous and showy worship now performed under the roof of that old cathedral, and the simple prayers and songs of the few disciples who were wont to meet here in some obscure chamber "with their bishops and deacons," sev-

enteen hundred years ago. Where are the successors of those primitive Christians?

"It was with such thoughts that I went forth on the morning of the LORD's day to find the Evangelical Chapel in the *Rue de l'Arbre Sec*. I looked in at the cathedral and at other churches, splendid with pictures and images, as I past by, and beheld their devotions; and it seemed to me that the city could hardly have been more given to idolatry in the palmy days of Pagan Rome, than it is at this day. In these magnificent structures the Christian traveler looks in vain for anything like what he has learned from the New Testament. The worship, instead of being offered exclusively and directly in CHRIST's name to the one living and true God, is offered to deified mortals, and chiefly to Mary, "the mother of God." Instead of being addressed only to an invisible God, who is a spirit, and who must be worshipped in spirit and in truth, it is offered to images and pictures, (and those, for the most part, of no superior description,) and to dead men's bones. Not in such places, nor where such worship is offered, are we to look for the true succession from the apostles and primitive martyrs, the true Catholic Church, which is the body of CHRIST."

Dr. Bacon's letter is addressed to an Association of Benevolent Ladies in New Haven, whose contributions have gone for a number of years past, through the Foreign Evangelical Society, (now the Am. and For. Chr. Union,) towards the support of an evangelical missionary in Lyons. In that city, containing with its immediate environs at least 300,000 inhabitants—next to Paris, the most populous and influential city of France—the great centre of Papal influence—the truth, according to Dr. Baird, has made greater progress within the last twenty years than in any other city of the same country. "The work began in 1825, or even earlier, in the efforts of a pious Swiss Protestant shoemaker. In the humble apartment of this poor man little meetings were held for reading the Scriptures and prayer. It was at these meetings, we believe, that Mr. Moureton, the brave grenadier of Napoleon, (who was in the battle of Leipsic, and several others in the later years of the reign of that wonderful man,) was converted." There was of course a considerable body of Protestantism there before; but this unfortunately had ceased to be evangelical; like the Protestantism of France generally had glided into dead rationalistic formality. The church here noticed is a wholly new and independent movement. The pious grenadier, Mr. Moureton, in the capacity of a deacon and colporteur, has done much to promote it for a series of years by his labors among the laboring population of Lyons and its sub-

urbs. The Rev. Adolphe Monod, settled as one of the pastors of the regular Protestant church in 1829, was soon after "brought to the saving knowledge of Christ, and began to preach the true Gospel with great zeal and power;" the result of which was, that the worldly-minded consistory of the church took offence, and soon after deposed him from his office. In this way he became the head of the small evangelical interest just noticed, which now assumed the character of a separate church, and has since grown into its present importance. It is remarkable however, that this improved Protestantism has derived but little of its material from the ranks of the old Protestantism. "Mr. Monod soon found that the new church was to be increased not so much by bringing back the degenerate Protestants from their rationalism to the simplicity of the gospel, as by conversions from among the Roman Catholics. Thus his enterprise became from the outset a work of evangelism among the manufacturing population of the city and its crowded suburbs. Into that field of labor he entered with great zeal and great success. And when, on the removal of Mr. Monod to Paris a few years ago, he was succeeded by Mr. Fisch, the work went on with undiminished prosperity"—that is, the work of turning Catholics into a much better sort of Protestants than could be made generally from the Protestant body itself. Dr. Bacon describes the congregation as very plain, made up for the most part of common laboring people of the lower class, but still as much resembling in its intelligent appearance and simple worship what he had been accustomed to in Puritan America; so that he felt himself, stranger though he was, among brethren of the same household of faith. In the afternoon, he attended a meeting of the brotherhood for mutual conference and inquiry.

"It was held in a school-room, and very much resembled a Congregational church meeting in New England. There was however one obvious difference. Those brethren were not merely concerned with the working of a system defined and understood in all its details, and familiar to them from their childhood. With the New Testament in their hands, they were inquiring after principles and rules of church order; and the question which then chiefly occupied their attention, and seemed somewhat to divide their opinions, was whether the government of their church should be in part committed to a body of elders, or retained entire in the hands of the assembled brethren. As I listened to the discussion, I could not but admire the free and manly yet fraternal spirit in which it was conducted. And as I saw what a school for the development of various intellectual gifts as well as for the culture of Christian affec-

tion, that church had been under its simple democratic organization, I felt quite sure that those brethren, with all their confidence in their teachers, would not be easily persuaded to subvert a system to which they were already so greatly indebted, or to divest themselves of the right of freely debating and voting on all their interests and duties as a church."

The letter states, that there are now in the city and suburbs four chapels, in addition to the mother church, one with a distinct pastor the other three missionary preaching places—that four ministers, several evangelists and a number of colporteurs, are constantly employed—that the total number of communicants in 1850 was 440, while about 2500 persons were more or less directly connected with the evangelical community; whereupon the excellent and much respected writer concludes:

"I think that in these facts the ladies who formerly contributed to aid the good work at Lyons, will find evidence that their coöperation was not in vain. Rarely have I enjoyed anything more than I enjoyed my visit to that missionary and apostolical church. Nor do I know where to look for a more-satisfactory representation of the ideal of primitive Christianity than may be found in the city which was made illustrious so long ago by the labors of Irenæus, and by the martyrdom of Pothinus and Blandina."

In reading this, we were reminded of certain notices of the same place, in somewhat similar style, from the pen of the Rev. Daniel Wilson, (then of Islington, but better known since as Bishop of Calcutta,) in his work entitled "*Travels on the Continent of Europe in the Summer of 1823;*" as also of certain parallel passages in the same work, relating to the early and later Christianity of the celebrated city of Milan. Take in the case of Lyons the following extracts:

"This morning I have visited St. Irenée, the site of the ancient city, though now only a suburb. I here visited the Roman baths at the Ursuline Monastery (formerly so, for all the monasteries and convents were abolished at the Revolution.) These baths consist of a series of numerous dark vaults, communicating with each other, about twenty feet under ground; but no longer interesting, except from their antiquity. I then went to what was the garden of the Minimes, and saw the remains of the Roman Amphitheatre, where the early Christians were exposed to the wild beasts. This scene affected me extremely. The form of the Amphitheatre remains, after a lapse of sixteen or seventeen centuries. Some traces may be discovered of the rising seats of turf, and several dilapidated brick vaults seem to indicate the places where the wild beasts,

and perhaps the holy martyrs, were guarded. It is capable of holding an immense assemblage—perhaps 30 or 40,000 persons. A still more elevated range of seats, to which you ascend by decayed stone steps, seem to have been the place allotted for the magistrates and regulators of the barbarous shows. A peaceful vineyard now flourishes where these scenes of horror once reigned. The tender garden shrub springs in the seats and vaults. The undisturbed wild flowers perfume the air. A stranger now and then visits the spot, and calmly inquires if that was the Amphitheatre which once filled all Christendom with lamentation. What a monster is persecution, whether Pagan, Popish, or Protestant! And yet, till the beginning of the last century, it was hardly banished from the general habits of Europe. Would to God that even now it could be said to be utterly rooted out!

"I visited, after this, the church of St. Irenée, built in the time of the Romans, when the liberty of public worship was refused the Christians. It is subterraneous, and contains the bones of the many thousand Christians who were martyred in the year 202, under the emperor Severus. It is of this noble army of martyrs that Milner gives such an affecting account. An inscription on the church states, that St. Pothinus was sent by Polycarp, and founded it; and was martyred under the emperor Antoninus; that St. Irenæus succeeded him, and converted an infinite multitude of Pagans, and suffered martyrdom, together with nineteen thousand Christians, besides women and children, in the year 202; and that in the year 470, the church was beautified. I have not an exact recollection of what Milner says, and therefore may be wrong in giving credit to some of these particulars; but I have a strong impression that the main facts agree with the tradition on the spot; and I confess, I beheld the scene with veneration. I could almost forgive the processions which are twice in the year made to this sacred place, if it were not for the excessive ignorance and superstition attending them.

"Near to this church are some fine remains of a Roman aqueduct, for conveying water to the city, built at the time of Julius Cæsar. A convent of three hundred nuns has arisen since the peace, in the same place, of the order of St. Michel, where many younger daughters are sent from the best families, to be got out of the way, just the same as under the ancient regime. In saying this, I do not forget that the education in many of the convents is, in some respects, excellent, and that the larger number of young persons are placed there merely for a few years for that purpose. Still the whole system is decidedly bad, and unfriendly to the highest purposes of a generous education."

"Upon looking carefully into Milner's Ecclesiastical History, since I came home, I find there were two early persecutions of the

Christians at Vienne and Lyons (neighboring French towns,) one about the year of our Lord 169, under the emperor Marcus Antoninus; the second under Septimus Severus, about the year 202. The first of these is best known, and the accounts in Milner refer to it. The scene of its cruel executions was the Amphitheatre which I visited as I have above mentioned. The second is not so credibly attested, but at the same time may on the whole be believed to have taken place. The church of St. Irenée relates exclusively to it. Pothinus was bishop of Lyons during the first cruelties; he had been a disciple of the blessed Polycarp, the contemporary of the apostle John. He perished about the year 169, being upwards of ninety years of age; he had been sent, in all probability, by Polycarp from Smyrna to found these French churches; for the merchants of Smyrna and Lyons were the chief navigators of the Mediterranean sea. This could not be very long before the persecution burst out. He was accompanied in his apostolical labors by Irenæus, an Asiatic Greek also, who wrote the interesting and authentic account of the first acts of the martyrs, preserved by Eusebius, and given so well by Milner. Irenæus succeeded Pothinus as bishop, and suffered martyrdom in the persecution of 202."

The animus of the writer in all this, the inward posture with which he looks upon the past and its relation to the present, comes out more clearly in the notice he takes of Milan and its distinguished prelates St. Ambrose and St. Charles Borromeo.

"*Sunday morning, Sept. 14.*—This is one of my melancholy Sundays. An immense Catholic town of one hundred and fifty thousand souls—the ecclesiastical apparatus enormous; about two hundred churches, eighty convents, and one hundred religious houses—compare this with the Protestant establishment of Birmingham or Manchester, which fall as far short of what such a crowded population fairly demands, as the Milan establishment exceeds it. We might surely learn something in England of the duty of greater zeal and attention to our pure form of Christianity, from the excessive diligence of the Catholics in their corrupt superstitions.

"I feel a peculiar veneration for Milan on two accounts: St. Ambrose, whom Milner dwells on with such commendations, was the light of this city in the fourth century; Carlo Borromeo, whose benevolence exceeds all description, was archbishop here in the sixteenth. This last I know at present little of; but Ambrose was one of the most humble and spiritual of the fathers of the church, two or three centuries before Popery, properly speaking, began. In this city Ambrose preached: it was here Austin heard him, attracted by the fame of his eloquence. It was here also, that Angilbertus, bishop of Milan in the ninth century, refused to own the

supremacy of the Pope ; indeed, the church of Milan did not submit to the Roman see till two hundred years afterwards. May God raise up another Ambrose to purify and recall the city and churches, which he instructed thirteen or fourteen centuries ago ! Nothing is impossible with God ; but Popery seems to infatuate this people. On the church of Milan notices are affixed, that whoever causes a mass to be said there, may deliver any one he chooses from purgatory. In the mean time, this debasing superstition goes hand in hand with secret infidelity and unblushing vice."

"St. Ambrose died in the year 397, in the 57th year of his age, and the 23d of his episcopate. He has been charged with leaning too much towards the incipient superstitions of his day, and thus unconsciously of helping forward the growth of monastic bondage and prelatical pride. Something of this charge may be true ; but he lived and died firm and unbending in all the fundamentals of divine truth. He loved the Saviour. He depended on his merits only for justification. He relied on the illumination and grace of the Holy Spirit. He delighted in communion with God. A rich unction of godliness rests on his writings ; and he was one of the most fervent, humble, laborious, and charitable of all Christian bishops."

"I have witnessed to-day, with grief and indignation, all the superstitions of Popery in their full triumph. In other towns, the neighborhood of Protestantism has been some check on the display of idolatry ; but here in Italy, where a Protesant is scarcely tolerated, except in the chapels of ambassadors, you see what things tend to ; Popery has its unimpeded course ; every thing follows the guidance and authority of the prevailing taste in religion.

"At half-past ten this morning we went to the cathedral, where seats were obtained for us in the gallery near the altar. We saw the whole of the proceedings at High Mass—priests almost without end—incense—singing—music—processions—perpetual changes of dress—four persons with mitres, whom the people called the little bishops—a crowd of people coming in and going out, and staring around them ; but not one prayer, nor one verse of the Holy Scriptures intelligible to the people, not even if they knew Latin ; nor one word of a sermon ; in short, it was nothing more nor less than a PAGAN SHOW.

"We returned to our inn, and, after our English service, we went to see the catechising. This was founded by Borromeo, in the sixteenth century, and is one of the peculiarities of the diocese of Milan. The children meet in classes of ten or twenty, drawn up between the pillars of the vast cathedral, and separated from each other by curtains ; the boys on one side, the girls on the other. In all the churches of the city there are classes also. Many

grown people were mingled with the children. A priest, and sometimes a layman, sat in the midst of each class, and seemed to be explaining familiarly the Christian religion. The sight was quite interesting. Tables for learning to write were placed in different recesses. The children were exceedingly attentive. At the door of each school, the words, *pax vobis*, peace be unto you, were inscribed on a board; the names of the scholars were also on boards. Each school had a small pulpit, with a green cloth in front, bearing the Borromean motto, *Humilitas*.

"Now what can, in itself, be more excellent than all this? But mark the corruption of Popery: these poor children are all made members of a fraternity, and purchase indulgences for their sins by coming to school. A brief of the Pope, dated 1609, affords a perpetual indulgence to the children in a sort of running lease of six thousand years, eight thousand years, &c., and these indulgences are applicable to the recovering of souls out of purgatory; the prayers also before school are full of error and idolatry. All this I saw with my own eyes and heard with my own ears; for I was curious to understand the bearings of these celebrated schools. Thus is the infant mind fettered and imprisoned.

"Still I do not doubt that much good may be done on the whole—the Catholic catechisms contain the foundation of the Christian religion, a general view of Scripture history, explanations of the creation and redemption of mankind, some good instructions on the moral law, sound statements on the divinity of Christ, and the Holy Trinity; some acknowledgments of the fall of man, and the necessity of the grace of God's Holy Spirit; with inculcations of repentance, contrition, humility, self-denial, watchfulness, and preparation for death and judgment. These catechisms are not brief summaries, but rather full explanations of religion; making up small volumes of fifty or more pages. In the frontispiece of the catechism for the diocese of Geneva is the following affecting sentence, under the figure of our Lord, "*Son amour et mon crime ont mis Jésus à mort*"—a sentiment which cannot but produce good. Still all is wofully mixed up with superstition, and error, and human traditions; and the consequence of this mixture is, that vital truths are so associated in the mind, from early youth, with the follies of Popery, that even the most pious men of that communion do not enough distinguish between them. If you deny transubstantiation, they suppose you disbelieve the divinity of Christ; if you avow that you are not a Papist, they suppose that you are a heretic, and have renounced the faith, &c. It was thus that such eminent Christians as Pascal, Nicole, Quesnel, Fénelon, and the great men of the Jansenist school, lived and died in the church of Rome. "A voluntary humility," as well as the "worshipping of angels,"—Coloss. ii. 18—may well be noted by St. Paul as an er-

ror, which ought zealously to be excluded from the Christian church."

"I was vexed on returning to Eng'and, and consulting my books, that I had been so long ignorant of the history and character of Borromeo. He is considered by the Roman Catholic writers as the model of all virtues, and the great restorer of ecclesiastical discipline in the sixteenth century. I have not been able to satisfy myself in what degree he was a true Christian, in the Scriptural sense of the word. That he was devoted to the superstitions of Popery, and was a firm upholder of the Roman see, cannot be doubted; but I have no access to his sermons or letters, so as to judge whether any living embers of the faith and love of Christ were smothered at the bottom of these superstitions. His habits of devotion, his self-denial, his zeal, his fortitude, his humility, and especially his unbounded and almost unparalleled benevolence, which are ascribed to him by universal consent, would lead one to hope that, notwithstanding "the wood, and hay, and stubble," accumulated on it, he was building on the true "foundation, Christ Jesus."—1 Cor. iii. 11, 12.

"He was born at Arona in 1538, in a small apartment which I saw behind the church; and was of one of the noblest and most opulent families of Italy. At the age of eleven he had several livings given him by his uncle the Cardinal de Medici, who was elected Pope in 1549. In his twenty-third year he was created cardinal by the same pontiff, and managed the proceedings of the council of Trent, as well as the chief temporal affairs of the Pope, for some years. This I consider as by far the most unfavorable part of Borromeo's life, as to the cultivation of personal piety. Such employments at Rome must have initiated him into all the system of that artful and secular court—and he who was intrusted to draw up the Trent catechism, must at that time have had little real Christian knowledge or feeling. However, in 1565 he left Rome, and went to reside at Milan, of which he had been made archbishop.

"Here begins the bright part of Borromeo's history. He had now to preside over the largest diocese of Italy, consisting of not less than eight hundred and fifty parishes, many of them in the wildest regions of the Alps. He began by resigning all his other preferments, by giving up to his family his chief estates, and by dividing the revenues of his archbishopric into three parts—one for the poor—another for the building and reparation of churches—the third for his domestic expenditure as bishop; all the accounts of which he submitted annually to the examination of his clergy. He next totally renounced the splendor in which he had lived at Rome, reduced the number of his servants, forbade the use of silk garments in his palace, rendered his household a pattern of edifica-

tion, slept himself on boards, prolonged his watchings and prayers to a late hour of the night, wore an under dress coarse and common, and devoted himself to perpetual fasts and abstinences.

"He then entered on the task of restoring decayed discipline and order throughout his vast diocese. To this end he was indefatigable in visiting himself every parish under his care, held frequent ecclesiastical synods, and established a permanent council, which met monthly to inspect and regulate the conduct of the priests. In this manner his cotemporaries agree in asserting, that he removed various scandals which prevailed amongst all classes of the faithful, abolished many superstitious usages, and checked the ignorance and abuses of the secular and regular clergy.

"His fortitude in carrying through his reforms, notwithstanding the violent opposition which he met with from all quarters, deserves remark. On one occasion an assassin was hired, who shot at him, whilst kneeling in prayer, in the archiepiscopal palace. Borromeo, unmoved, continued his devotions; and, when he rose from his knees, the bullet, which had been aimed at his back, but had been caught in the lawn sleeves of his dress, fell at his feet.

"His charities were unbounded. He built ten colleges, five hospitals, and schools and public fountains without number. Besides this, he bestowed annually the sum of thirty thousand crowns on the poor; and in various cases of public distress in the course of his life, as much as two hundred thousand crowns more.

"In the meantime, his personal virtues, his lowliness, his self-command, his forgiveness of injuries, his temperance, his prudence, his sanctity, the consistency of his whole character, (I speak after his biographers, whose veracity, I believe, is not questioned,) gave him such weight, that he not only rendered his immense diocese a model of good order and discipline, after an anarchy of eighty years, during which its archbishops had not resided, but extended his influence over the neighboring dioceses, and pushed his regulations throughout a great part of France and Germany.

"Perhaps his conduct during a pestilence which raged for six months at Milan is amongst the actions of his life which may lead one the most to hope that this benevolent and tender-hearted prelate was indeed animated with the fear and love of his Saviour. Nothing could restrain him from visiting his sick and dying flock, during the raging of this fatal malady; when his clergy entreated him to consult his own safety, he replied, that nothing more became a bishop than to face danger at the call of his duty. He was continually found in the most infected spots, administering consolation both to the bodies and souls of his perishing people; and he sold all the small remains of his ancient splendor, and even his bed, to give the produce to the distressed.

"The institution, or rather invention of Sunday schools, is again

a further evidence of something more than a superstitious state of heart. Nothing could be so novel as such institutions in the sixteenth century, and nothing so beneficial. When we recollect the public admiration which has rested on such schools in our own Protestant and enlightened country, though planned scarcely fifty years back, we may estimate the piety of mind, the vigor and penetration of judgment, which could lead a Catholic archbishop and cardinal to institute them two hundred years ago, and to place them on a footing which has continued to the present day. May I not add, that possibly some of the superstitious usages now attached to these schools may have grown up since the time of Borromeo. Certainly the indulgences which I saw were of the date of 1609, five-and-twenty years after his death; for the reader must be informed that, in the year 1584, this benevolent bishop fell a victim to fever caught in the mountainous parishes of his diocese, which he was visiting in his usual course.

"As a preacher he was most laborious. Though he had an impediment in his speech, and a difficulty in finding words to express readily his meaning, he overcame these hindrances, and preached most assiduously on Sundays and festivals at Milan. His biographers say, that the higher classes in the city were offended with him, and did not frequent his sermons; but that the common people flocked with eagerness to hear him. Perhaps something of what the Apostle calls "the offence of the cross," may be traced in this. It does not at all lessen my hope of Borromeo's piety, that the rich and great did not follow him.

"Such is a faint sketch of some of the chief events in the life of Charles Borromeo. My materials are scanty, especially as to the spiritual state of his heart and affections. It is for God only to judge on this subject: but charity rejoices to hope all things in such a case. I acknowledge that his simple and sublime motto, HUMILITAS, is very affecting to my mind. I trust it was the expression of his real character; and that his submission to the usurpations of the Romish church may have arisen from that faulty prostration of the understanding to human authority, which is so apt to engraft itself, under circumstances like those of Borromeo, on scriptural lowliness of spirit. Oh, if he had more fully studied and obeyed his Bible, and had read with honest candor the treatises of his great contemporaries, the reformers of Germany and Switzerland, he might, perhaps, have become the LUTHER or ZUINGLE, instead of, what he actually was, only the FENELON of Italy."

The reference made in the foregoing extract to *indulgences* shows the writer, with all his education, to be one of those who stick in the vulgar notion still of this doctrine, and in spite of all evidence to the contrary insist on forcing upon the Roman church an abomination here which she continually disowns.

The idea of an indulgence to commit sin, a license in form to do wrong, is a pure fiction got up by the seething brain of fanaticism to make Popery odious; and is just as little entitled to regard at best, as the charge brought against Presbyterians for instance of holding and teaching, that there are infants in hell not a span long. An indulgence has not even the force of a pardon for past sin, however repented of truly by the sinner. It is a wholly different conception, which we have no right to drag hither and thither to suit our own prejudice, but are bound in common honesty, if we must oppose it, to understand and handle at all events in the sense of its own system, and not in another sense.

One can hardly help feeling somewhat amused with the evident embarrassment, in which the good vicar of Islington finds himself with his facts. He has in his mind a certain scheme of religion, what he conceives to be the clear sense of the Gospel in regard to this great interest, which is at war with the whole idea he has formed of Romanism; to such an extent, that he feels bound to think of this last only as a system of unmitigated abominations, a wholesale apostacy from the truth, and such a tissue of foolery and impiety in the name of religion as can scarcely be reconciled with the opinion, that there are any pious persons at all within its communion. He finds it a great deal easier to admit the true godliness of ten "witnesses" opposing the church in the middle ages, even though it should be among such a sect as the Albigenses, than to be entirely satisfied with that of one only, quietly submitting to the authority of this church, believing in transubstantiation, and praying to saints and images, in its bosom. And still he is a good man, anxious to find his own ideal of evangelical piety as broadly as possible diffused in the history of the world, and cordially disposed to acknowledge and honor it wherever it comes in his way. With the instance of Ambrose, in the case before us, he can get along without any *very* serious difficulty, taking Milner's Church History for his guide, and holding fast always to the common Anglican theory of a marked distinction, between the Christianity of the first four or five centuries and that of the thousand years following. There are things hard to understand in the piety of Ambrose and Augustine, even as we have it portrayed to us in Milner; for which however an apology is found in the supposition, that standing as they did on the borders of the great apostacy which was to follow, they came accidentally here and there within the folds of its impending shadow, without still belonging to it properly in the substance of their faith. But the idea

of any similar exhibition of apostolical religion from the same see of Milan, under the full-blown Papacy and in open communion with its corruptions—and all this too in the middle of the sixteenth century, and in the person of one who had been employed to draw up the Roman Catechism for the Council of Trent—was altogether another matter, and something not provided for plainly in any way by our tourist's previous theory. The good account he hears of St. Borromeo perplexes him. He finds it impossible to unite in his mind the image of a truly holy archbishop, such as he is described to have been, with the mummerly and superstition of the modern Milan, (a city wholly given to idolatry,) which yet hardly could have been much better in the age of the Reformation, when presided over by this canonized man. Did he not hear the trumpet of the Reformation, giving no uncertain sound just over the Alps? And how then could he refuse to make common cause with it against Rome and the Pope? The bishop that was to be of Calcutta cannot understand it; but being, as we have said a good man, he makes it a point on his return home to look into the character of this same Borromeo, with such literary helps as he can find for this purpose; when, lo, to his own great surprise, not to say amiable confusion, it appears that there is no reason whatever to question the extraordinary sanctity of the man, so far as least as the outward show of consecration to works of piety is concerned. So the Rev. Daniel Wilson, in the exercise of that charity which hopeth all things and believeth all things, feels himself constrained to bear open testimony to its reality; the only question being still, whether the seeming sanctity after all had any proper root in the doctrine of justification by faith, the one great principle of religion in its true Protestant form. On this point a lingering doubt remains, which could be properly dissipated only by studying the character in question in the mirror of his own written thoughts; a privilege, which our author had not still enjoyed, when he first published his travels. Subsequently however it came in his way to look into the soul of the Catholic saint in this way; and now every doubt as to the genuineness of his piety was forced to retire; so that in the second edition of the same book, we have finally a free, full and altogether joyful acknowledgment of the fact, that in the person of Borromeo the Roman communion actually produced, so late as the 16th century, out of its own bosom and as it were in the very face of the Reformation itself, a veritable saint of like station and piety with the great St. Ambrose of the fourth century, and worthy even to be set in some sort of comparison with

the Protestant saints, Zuingli, Luther, and Calvin. Under huge incrustations of Popish superstition, may be clearly traced still, in this extraordinary case, the lineaments of a truly evangelical faith, an actual diamond of grace, formed no one can tell how in the very heart of what might seem to be most fully at war with its whole nature. The case is set down accordingly as a sort of grand exception to common history, the next thing to a *lusus nature* in the world of grace. Anselm, Bernard, Thomas a Kempis, Fenelon, and a few other like celebrities perhaps, names "*rari nantes in gurgite vasto*," are referred habitually to the same convenient category or rubric. They are spiritual curiosities, which no one should be expected fully to understand or explain.

In all this, however, we have two utterly false conceptions at work in the mind of the vicar of Islington himself. In the first place, his estimate of the extent to which real piety has existed in the Catholic church, both before the Reformation and since, is in no sort of agreement with the truth. In the second place, his imagination that this piety is in no sense the proper product of the Catholic religion as such, but something violently exceptional rather to its natural course, is not a whit less visionary and unsound.

Both these notions, we know, enter largely into our common Protestant thinking. But this does not make them right. They form in conjunction a mere blind prejudice, which like every other prejudice of this sort is sure to prove hurtful, in the end, to the cause it seems to favor and serve. Of all styles of upholding Protestantism, we may say, that is absolutely the worst, which can see no sense or truth whatever in Catholicism, but holds itself bound to make it at every point as bad as possible, and to fight off with tooth and nail every word that may be spoken in its praise. Such wholesale and extreme pugnacity, may be very convenient; as it calls for no discrimination, it requires of course neither learning nor thought, but can be played off under all circumstances, by almost any polemic, with about the same good effect. Its strength consists mainly in calling nick-names, in repeating outrageous charges without regard to any contradiction from the other side, in thrumming over thread-bare common-places received by tradition from the easy credulity of times past, in huge exaggerations, and vast distortions, and bold insulting insinuations thrown out at random in any and every direction.¹ But however convenient all this may be, re-

¹ As a single exemplification, take the *Ladies'* petition got up a few months

quiring little reading, and less thought, and no politeness nor charity whatever, it is high time to see that it is a system of tactics, which needs in truth only a slight change of circumstances at any time to work just the opposite way from that in which it is meant to work. The vanity and impotency of it must become apparent, in proportion precisely as men are brought to look at things with their own eyes; and then the result is, that sensible and well-bred people, not those who go by the text book of a sect, but such as move in a wider range of thought and have some better knowledge of the world, political and literary men, seeing how they have been imposed upon by the current slang, are very apt to be taken with a sort of quiet disgust towards the whole interest which they find to be thus badly defend-

since for the Legislature of Pennsylvania, in the city of Philadelphia, under the auspices of the notorious Giustiniani, calling for the suppression of nunneries, under the gross insinuation of their being only seats of licentiousness and sin. Strange "ladies" they must have been, that could lend their names to such an infamous libel on the purity of their own sex. The like insult directed towards the Episcopalians, Methodists or Presbyterians, would have at once drawn upon itself the angry frown of society, as a breach of all decency as well as charity. But as directed against the *Catholics* only, the blackguardism of the thing was generally not felt. Certain evangelical papers caught up even with great gusto, as a capital hit, the flying report that the Legislature had referred the petition to the Committee on Vice and Immorality. Now if *any* ground had ever been given for scandal in the history of American nunneries, one might have some patience with such ribald ruffianism, hiding its malignity under the cloak of religion. But what well informed person needs to be told, that every apology of this sort is wanting! All attempts yet made to blast the good name of these institutions among us, have recoiled with signal discomfiture on the heads of those who have acted as leaders in the vile crusade. It is enough to refer to Charlestown, Pittsburg, and Montreal—to the *memory* of Miss Reed, Dr. Brownlee and Maria Monk. On the other hand, the good works of these religious houses have been too manifold and plain in every direction, to be at all rationally called in question. Now in all seriousness we ask, what right in these circumstances have people pretending to be themselves respectable and pious, to vilify and calumniate the inmates of such institutions in the way of which we now speak, as though they had forfeited all claim to the most ordinary courtesies of well bred life! Just as little right, we say confidently, as any gentleman has to outrage in the same way any Ladies' Seminary whatever that is to be found in the land.—This same Giustiniani is the apostle of German Catholicism, as it has been called, or Rongianism, in this country; whose *wonderful* success in founding churches in New York, Rochester, Buffalo and Philadelphia, has been duly trumpeted and glorified in times past by a part of our religious press; though the same papers have never considered it necessary to let us know, how completely the infidel sham has in each case run out since into clear smoke. He has now gone to Italy, we are told, to help set things right in that unfortunate part of the world.

ed, and so to look favorably in the same measure on the other side, as being at so many points plainly an injured and persecuted cause. To make our opposition to Romanism of any weight, the first condition would seem to be clearly that we should have made ourselves acquainted with it on its own ground, that we should have taken some pains to learn from the system itself what it means and wills. But of all that army of zealots, who hold themselves perfectly prepared to demolish it at a blow through the stage or press, how few are there probably who have ever felt it necessary to get their facts from other than the most common Protestant sources? Take indeed our ministers generally. Has one in fifty of them ever examined seriously a Catholic work of divinity, whether didactic, practical or historical? An ordinary anti-popery assault implies no preparation of this sort whatever; but rather a dogged purpose only, not to hear or believe a single word the Catholics say for themselves, while everything contrary to this is forced upon them from other quarters, as the voice and sense of their system. The sooner all such fanatical indecencies can be brought to an end, the better. They help not Protestantism, but serve only to involve it in reproach.

To return to the two imaginations already named. It is a sheer prejudice to suppose, in the first place, that cases of sanctity and true godliness have been, or are now, of only rare and extraordinary occurrence in the Roman communion. Any one who is willing at all to look into the actual history of the church, to listen to its own voice, to study its institutions, to make himself acquainted with its works, will soon find reason enough to rejoice in a widely different and far more favorable view. The single institution of the "Sisters of Charity," with its manifold services of mercy and love, is of itself fact enough to upset, for any thoughtful mind, the vulgar idea that Romanism is without religion, and a source of evil only without any good. This is however but one among many illustrations looking the same way, which the charity, "that rejoiceth not in iniquity but in the truth," need never be at a loss to find in the same church. That must be a stout bigotry indeed, which is able to turn aside the force of all such examples, by resolving them into self-righteousness or mercenary motives of any still lower kind. It has its fit parallel only in the calumnies, that were used in the first ages to blacken the virtues of Christianity into crimes among the heathen.

But in the second place it is just as blind a prejudice again, to suppose that the piety of the Roman church, such as it is,

springs not from the proper life of the system itself, but is there rather by accident, and as something out of place, and so to speak in spite of the unfriendly connections with which it is surrounded; so that if it could only be torn up from the soil in which it thus happens to stand, and transplanted into a truly evangelical liberty, it might be expected to thrive and flourish at a much better rate. The native and as it were normal tendency of Catholicism, in the view of this prejudice, is not to piety at all, but only to superstition and sin; for it is taken to be a systematic conspiracy against the doctrines of grace from the beginning; and hence when we meet with the phenomenon of a truly evangelical spirit here and there in its communion, as in the case of Pascal or Fenelon, we are bound to see in it a wonderful exception to established law, and to admire so much the more the power of the evangelical principle, which is sufficient even in such untoward circumstances to bring to pass so great a miracle. No one however can study the subject to any extent for himself, without being led to see that the very reverse of all this is the truth. Catholicism is inwardly fitted for the production of its own forms of piety, and owes them to no foreign source or influence whatever. Its saints are not exotics, that pine after other climes and skies, but products of home growth, answerable in all respects to the conditions that surround them. To place them in other relations would be, not to advance, but to cripple their life. Borromeo was constitutionally a Catholic in his piety, and not a Protestant. The same may be said of Fenelon, of Philip de Neri, of Anselm and Bernard, of Ambrose, and of the old church fathers generally. The piety of all of them has a complexion, which is materially different from any that we meet with in the modern Protestant world. We mean not by this to call in question the reality of this last, or its high worth; all we wish to say is, that it is of another character and order, and that what we find of saintliness in the Roman church is strictly and legitimately from itself and not from abroad. To Protestantize it even in imagination, is to turn it into caricature and to eviscerate it at last of its very life. What could the early fathers do with themselves in New England? Such an institution as that of the Sisters of Charity can never be transferred to purely Protestant ground; as no such ground either could ever have given it birth. Attempts are made in our own time to furnish a Protestant version of the same idea, under what claims to be a higher and more evangelical form; for the purpose of supplying an evident want. But nothing of this sort will ever equal the original design, or be more indeed than a

weak and stunted copy of this on the most narrow and ephemeral scale. It is only in the bosom of ideas, principles and associations, which are Catholic distinctively and *not* Protestant, that charity of this sort finds itself perfectly at home. And just so it is with the piety of this church in general. It is fairly and truly native to the soil from which it springs. That church, with all its supposed errors and sins, has ever had power in its own way to produce a large amount of very lovely religion. If it has been the mother of abominations, it has been unquestionably the mother also of martyrs and saints. It is a sorry business to pretend to deny this, or to try to falsify the fact into the smallest possible dimensions, for the sake of some miserable pre-conception with which it will not agree. We do but belittle ourselves, when we resort to strategy so poor as that. To deal with Romanism to any purpose, we must get rid of the notion that it carries in it no truth, no grace, no principle of religious activity and life; that it is as bad as infidelity, if not a good deal worse; that it lacks all the attributes of a church, and is

¹ We clip the following from an editorial of the *New York Observer*, called forth not long ago by a sermon which Archbishop Hughes preached on his return from Europe, as the paper sneeringly adds, "without the Cardinal's hat." It is curiously characteristic.

"The Tribune finds fault with Bishop Hughes, for resisting the progress of Socialism in Europe. Between Romanism and Socialism there is little to choose, so far as the moral improvement of the people is concerned. They are essentially Anti-Christian, and many wise and good men regard infidelity as the least evil of the two, when the choice must be between it and Popery. We have therefore regarded it as one of the phenomena of the times, worth observing and recording, that the leaders of the Romanizing and the Fourierite parties in this country, are now discussing the comparative worth of their two schemes, for the improvement of mankind. We regard them both with equal detestation, and in the controversy now in progress, are quite indifferent as to the issue."

The same editorial reproaches the sermon, in the beginning, with betraying a want of sympathy with the liberty spirit that is now at work in Europe. So in general our American anti-popery is ever ready to fall in with the revolutionary tendency abroad, as though it must necessarily be both patriotic and pious—needing only plenty of *Bibles* to tame the whirlwind and keep it right. And yet notoriously this movement is prevalently irreligious, radical, socialistic and infidel, threatening the foundations of all government and society. So it is regarded by the Catholic church; which is powerfully resisting it, and forms at this time, we verily believe, a most necessary bulwark in the old world against its terrible progress. But this the *N. Y. Observer* denounces, as hostility to the cause of liberty and the rights of man; while it goes on the next moment to make Catholicism just as bad as Socialism itself. We have heard before of the same sentiment being uttered in high places. But it is for all this none the less a truly abominable sentiment, that must sooner or later quail before the frown of

purely a synagogue of Satan or a mere human confederacy, for worldly and unhallowed ends. One wing of the Presbyterian church has it is true openly committed itself to this bold position, in pronouncing what they stigmatize as *Romish* baptism to be without force—unchurching virtually thus the whole church as it stood at the birth of the Reformation and for at least twelve hundred years before, and making such men as Augustine and Chrysostom, as well as Luther and Calvin of a later day, to be no better than unbaptized heathens, so far as any idea of covenant or sacramental grace is concerned; for it is notorious, that the baptism in question goes back, with all its objectionable features, not only to the fourth century, but beyond that to the days of Cyprian even and Tertullian. But no such brutum fulmen as this can stand. All history laughs it to scorn. The vitality of Romanism at this very time, and the evidently growing confusion of Protestantism, all the world over, show it to be idle as the passing wind. It is no time, in the crisis to which things are now coming, to think of settling the question between Protestantism and Rome, in this extravagant and fanatical way. There must be honesty enough to see and own good on the side of this *hated* church, as well as a keen scent for its sores. Take it simply as it appears in our own country, struggling finally into full organization, after years of crushing difficulty and persecution; and need we say, that it has merit and respectability enough in a religious view to give it some right to the same sort of genteel respect at least, that is felt to be proper towards almost every sect besides? Is its hierarchy at this time

intelligent and good men. A few years since Dr. Hengstenberg of Berlin, whose zeal for Protestantism none can question who have any knowledge of the man, was heavily pressed on this very point by a party which made a merit of treating Romanism in the same way—Protestants of the rationalistic no-religion school, who were disposed to place religion in mere opposition and contradiction to the Catholic church. But he had courage to say to such spirit, "Get thee behind me, Satan;" and to proclaim to the world that there is no comparison to be thought of between Infidelity and Catholicism, and that when it comes to a war with the first, all our affections and sympathies are bound to go joyfully with the last, as one grand division simply of the great army of faith to which all true Protestants as well as all true Catholics belong. The heartless fanaticism of the N. Y. Observer not only *infidelizes* such men as Bishops Cheverueux, England, Eccleston, Hughes, Kenrick, &c., (any of them good enough to compare with the Rev. Sydney E. Morse & Co., any day,) and Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of Charity, &c., in large number, in our own time; but goes away back to other times also, and swamps all the fathers and martyrs, after the first two centuries at least, in the same Acherontian lake.

a whit behind that of the Episcopal church, in point of learning, piety, or official diligence and zeal? Has any church among us produced better specimens of apostolical sanctity, than the first bishop of Boston for instance or the first bishop of Charleston, and others also that might easily be named; men, whose virtues adorn the history of the country, and whose parallels are not so readily offered in other communions, that we can afford for this reason to pass their memory into ungrateful oblivion. It is not easy to read the writings of Bishop England, glowing with the eloquence of noble gentlemanly feeling as they do on almost every page, and not be filled with indignation, as well as moved even to tears at times, with the gross and cruel wrong which has been heaped upon the Catholics among us from the beginning, in the holy name of religion. What *right*, we ask again, have the zealots of other churches to lay aside here the laws of common courtesy, and to be just as rude and scurrilous as they please? What right have rabid pens, or still more rabid tongues, to make religion in this form the synonyme of impiety and unbelief, and when confronted with clear proofs and living examples of the contrary, to resolve all into hypocrisy, or happy inconsistency, as though it were not possible for piety to grow forth in any way from such a system? Some go so far as to tell us even, that no intelligent priest or layman in the Catholic church can seriously believe what he professes to believe. This however is such unmannerly rudeness as deserves no answer, come from what quarter it may.

But what we have in view now more particularly, is to expose the fallacy that lies in the extracts we have given from Dr. Bacon and Bishop Wilson, with regard to the nature of early Christianity, as compared with that particular modern scheme of religion, which they dignify with the title Evangelical, and which is for each of them the only true and perfect sense of the Gospel. Both writers assume, that there existed in the beginning, back of the corruptions and abuses of Romanism, and subsequently to the time of the Apostles, a certain golden age, longer or shorter, of comparatively pure religious faith, which truly represented still the simplicity and spirituality of the proper divine model of the church, as we have it plainly exhibited to us in the New Testament; and that this was in all material respects of one character precisely with what they now approve as the best style of Protestantism. But never was there a more perfect mistake.

It may be easy enough to show, that there are many points of difference between early Christianity and Romanism, as we find

this established in later times. But this fact is by no means sufficient to show, that the first was to the same extent in agreement with modern Protestantism, whether in the Episcopalian or in the Congregational form. It is clear on the contrary, that no such agreement has ever had place, but that modern Protestantism is still farther away from this older faith than the system by which it is supposed to have been supplanted in the middle ages. No defence of Protestantism can well be more insufficient and unsound, than that by which it is set forth as a pure *repristination* simply of what Christianity was at the beginning, either in the fourth century, or the third, or the second. It will always be found on examination to have no such character in fact; and every attempt to force upon the world any imagination of the sort, in favor of either Episcopacy, or Presbyterianism, or Independency, in favor of all or of any one of the three score and ten sects which at this time follow the Bible as their sole rule of faith, must only serve in the end by its palpable falsehood to bring suspicion and doubt on the whole cause which is thus badly upheld. Whatever differences there may be between the first ages and those that followed, it is still plain enough that the course of things was from the very start *towards* that order at least, which afterwards prevailed; that this later order therefore stands bound by true historical connection with what went before; and that Protestantism accordingly, as a still more advanced period in the general movement of history, holds a living relation to the first period only through the medium of the second, and is just as little a copy of the one in form as it is of the other. This we sincerely believe is the only ground, on which may be set up any rational defence of the great revolution of the 16th century, (unsupported as it stands by miracles or inspiration,) in conjunction with a true faith in the Divine character of the church. It is the theory of historical development, which assumes the possibility and necessity of a transition on the part of the church through various stages of form, (as in all growth,) for the very purpose of bringing out more and more fully always the true inward sense of its life, which has been one and the same from the beginning. When Romanists refuse every such view, and insist that their whole system has been handed down from the time of the Apostles, it *seems* not easy certainly to admit the pretence. But when Protestants also refuse the view, and pretend to give us things, in their several by no means harmonious systems, just as they were in the first ages of the church, the pretension is still more glaringly rash and false. However it may be with Romanism, it is certain that

Protestantism can never make good its claims on any such ground. And yet it will not do, to give up all historical connection with the church as it first started, and as it stood afterwards for fifteen hundred years—at least not without an overwhelming *Thus saith the Lord* in the form of miracles. The only escape then is in the formula of the same and yet not the same, legitimate growth, historical development. If this cannot stand, if it be found at war with the true idea of a Divine revelation, we for our part must give up all faith in Protestantism, and bow as we best can to the authority of the Roman church; for an interest which resolves itself virtually into infidelity, as Protestantism under every other view in which it can be put seems to us to do clearly, has no right, as in the end also it can have no power, to stand.

It needs but little knowledge of history certainly, to see that Christianity as it stood in the fourth century, and in the first part of the fifth, in the time of Jerome and Ambrose and Augustine, in the time of Chrysostom and Basil and the Gregories, was something very different from modern Protestantism, and that it bore in truth a very near resemblance in all material points to the later religion of the Roman church. This is most clear of course as regards full Puritanism, in the form it carries in New England; but it is equally true in fact of the Anglican system also, and this whether we take it in the low church or high church view. Episcopalians are indeed fond of making a great distinction, between the first four or five centuries and the ages that follow; telling us with much self-complacency, that the early church thus far was comparatively pure, that the Roman apostacy came in afterwards marring and blotting the fair face which things had before, and that the English church distinguished itself at the Reformation by its moderation and sound critical judgment, in discriminating here properly between the purity of the primitive faith and its subsequent adulterations. According to the most churchly view, the Reformation was for Anglicanism no revolution properly speaking at all, but the simple clearing away of some previous abuses, and a self-righting of the English church as a whole once more into its old habit and course. But this is altogether a most lame and desperate hypothesis. All history gives it the lie. The boasted discrimination of the English Protestantism vanishes into thin air, the moment we come to inquire into its actual origin and rise. Never was there a great movement, in which accident, caprice, and mere human passion, more clearly prevailed as factors, over the forces of calm judgment and sound reason. If under the pol-

itical auspices that ruled it, the system was indeed so fortunate as to hit the true mean in the way pretended, while all the Protestant world besides missed it, the advantage must be ascribed to its good luck far more than to its good judgment. The case however becomes still worse, when we look into the real nature of the advantage which is to be referred to this good luck. The main feature of it is episcopacy, with a king at the head of it instead of a pope. In virtue of this constitution, and some few peculiarities besides, Anglicanism piques itself on being a *jure divino* succession of the old English branch of the Church Catholic, while for want of such accidents other Protestant bodies, it is held, have no right to put in any similar claim. The charm lies in the notion of the episcopate, handed down by outward succession, as a sort of primary Divinely appointed mark and seal of the true church.

But what would such men as Cyprian, Ambrose, or Augustine, have thought of the glorification of the episcopate, with all that may go along with it in the English system besides, in any such outward style as this? They did indeed put a high value on episcopacy and some other things that Anglicanism contends for; but only as these interests were themselves comprehended in what they held to be a still wider and deeper system of truth. Episcopacy torn from the idea of that glorious unity, with which alone was felt to go the actual presence of Divine powers in the church, would have been for either of these fathers as perfectly powerless an institution for church ends, as any other scheme of government whatever. The plea then of falling back here to the ground of the first four or five centuries, is for the vindication even of this *accident* itself a false plea; for the episcopacy of that time, and its other points of agreement with modern Anglicanism, were mere circumstances in a wider scheme of thought, which this same Anglicanism disowns now as anti-christian and false. If it had a right to reform thus far, and might do so without losing its identity as a part of the church, no good reason can be shown why it had not as much right, if it saw proper, to reform still farther. The rupture with Catholicism is the grand point; over against which, the accident of retaining episcopacy, and some other fragments of the old system, dwindle into insignificance.

For in truth there is no return here to anything more than fragments of the early system, even in the dead view now mentioned. It is as pure a fiction as ever entered a good man's head, to dream as Bishop Wilson does that his favorite scheme of evangelical Episcopalianism prevailed in the fourth century;

and the case is not materially improved, by simply changing the dream into an Oxford or Tractarian shape. The whole idea of a marked chasm anywhere about the fifth century, dividing an older purer style of Christianity from the system that meets us in the middle ages, much as English episcopacy stands related to the papacy, is no better than a chimera; history is all against it; we might just as rationally pretend to fix any such dividing line in the eighth century or in the tenth.

According to Bishop Wilson, Ambrose was somewhat infected with the *incipient* superstitions of his day; but still "lived and died firm and unbending in all the fundamentals of divine truth;" by which is meant, that he looked to the merits of Christ for salvation, and built his religion on the doctrine of justification by faith, taking the Bible for his text book and guide, after the most approved evangelical fashion of the present time. "Ambrose was one of the most humble and spiritual of the fathers of the church," we are told, "two or three centuries before Popery properly speaking began." Even as late as the ninth century, the church of Milan is represented as still holding out against the claims of the Papacy; and not till two hundred years after that indeed, does the writer allow it to have submitted to the Roman see, and in this way to have been drawn fully and finally into the vortex of its corruptions. But if anything in the world can be said to be historically clear, it is the fact that with the close of the fourth century and the coming in of the fifth, the Primacy of the Roman See was admitted and acknowledged in all parts of the Christian world. This is granted by Barrow himself, in his great work on the Supremacy; though he tries to set aside the force of the fact, by resolving it into motives and reasons to suit his own cause. The promise of our Saviour to Peter, is always taken by the fathers in the sense that he was to be the centre of unity for the church, and in the language of Chrysostom to have the presidency of it throughout the whole earth. Ambrose and Augustine both recognise this distinction of Peter, over and over again, in the clearest and strongest terms. To be joined in communion with the see of Rome was in the view of this period to be in the bosom of the true church; to be out of that communion was to be in schism. It was not enough to be in union with any other bishop or body of bishops; the sacrament of unity was held to be of force only, as having regard to the church in its universal character; and this involved necessarily the idea of one universal centre, which by general consent was to be found in Rome only, and no where else.¹

¹ St. Ambrose relates in praise to his brother Satirus, that on reaching

Examples of the actual exercise of supreme power on the part of the Popes, in the fourth and fifth centuries, are so frequent and numerous, that nothing short of the most wilful obstinacy can pretend to treat them as of no account. In every great question of the time, whether rising in the East or in the West, all eyes show themselves every ready to turn towards the *cathe-dra Petri*, as the last resort for counsel and adjudication; all controversies, either in the way of appeal or complaint, or for the ratification of decisions given in other quarters, are made to come directly or indirectly in the end before this tribunal, and reach their final and conclusive settlement only through its intervention. The Popes, in these cases, take it for granted themselves, that the power which they exercise belongs to them of right, in virtue of the prerogative of their see; there is no appearance whatever of effort or of usurpation, in the part they allow themselves to act; it seems to fall to them as naturally, as the functions of a magistrate or judge in any case are felt to go along with the office to which they belong. And the whole world apparently regards the primacy, in the same way, as a thing of course, a matter fully settled and established in the constitution of the Christian church. We hear of no objection to it, no protest against it, as a new and daring presumption, or as a departure from the earlier order of Christianity.' The whole

shore after shipwreck, he was careful to inquire, whether the bishop of the place "agreed in faith with the Catholic bishops, that is with the Roman Church"—assuming communion with Rome thus to be a test of orthodoxy and catholicity.

¹ It is common to refer to the strong terms, in which St. Gregory the Great opposed the use of the title, "Universal Bishop," on the part of John the Faster, Bishop of Constantinople, as a proof that no similar character was then thought of in favor of the Roman see. But this is altogether too late, to be of the least historical force in any such view. The evidences of the acknowledgment of the primacy of Rome long before this on all sides, are too overwhelming a great deal to be for a moment disturbed, by the mere sound of what is here paraded as a contrary testimony. Gregory disliked the pretension of the title; it had for him a haughty sound, which fell not in with his sense of the respect that was due to other bishops. Even Peter, "the first member of the holy universal church, to whom the care of the whole church was committed," was to be regarded still as one among his brethren, and not as a single and exclusive head. In rejecting this title, Gregory certainly did not disclaim any superior authority in himself, as successor of Peter; for he himself affirmed the contrary in the most positive terms, and exercised in the most marked manner the powers of an actual ruler of the whole church. "Assuredly," says Mr. Allies in his attempt to uphold the Church of England, "if there was any Pontiff who, like St. Leo, held the most strong and deeply rooted convictions as to the

nature of the case implies, as strongly as any historical conditions and relations well could, that this precisely and no other order had been handed down from a time, beyond which no memory of man to the contrary then reached. So perfectly idle is the dream, that Popery, taken in the sense of an acknowledgment of the primacy of the Roman see, and of its right to be regarded as the centre of church unity, came in only some two or three centuries after the age of Ambrose, and was not fully admitted into Milan even before the eleventh century.

The idea of the primacy itself however, in the view now presented, was from the first but one necessary part of that general doctrine of the church, which the modern evangelical school is ever ready to denounce, as the introduction of Romanism and a complete falling away from the primitive scheme of faith. It implies of course episcopacy; but it implies also a great deal more. At the ground of it lies the conception of a truly Divine character belonging to the Church as a whole, and not to be separated from the attributes of unity and universality; the idea of the church thus as one, holy, and catholic; the idea of an actual continuation of Christ's presence and power in the church, according to the terms of the original apostolic commission; the idea of sacramental grace, the power of absolution, the working of miracles to the end of time, and a real communion of saints extending to the departed dead as well as to those still living on the earth. It is perfectly certain accordingly, that in the fourth and fifth centuries, all these and other naturally related conceptions, running very directly into the Roman corruptions as they are called of a later period, were in full operation and force; and this in no sporadic exceptional or accidental way merely, but with universal authority and as belonging to the inmost life and substance of the great mystery of Christianity. The fathers of this glorious period did indeed hold "all the fundamentals of divine truth," as Bishop Wilson is charitable enough to suppose; but they held them in no such order and view, as they are made to carry in the theory which Bishop Wilson would fain make to be the reigning sense of their faith, in spite of the "incipient superstitions" with which it was outwardly disfigured. We owe it to ourselves here to see and own the full truth. The

prerogatives of the Roman see, it was St. Gregory." His letters abound with admonitions, injunctions, threats, and decrees, directed to bishops in every part of the church, all of whom he treated as brethren whilst they were blameless; if they erred, admonishing them as a father; and punishing them as a judge when they proved delinquent.

religion of these fathers was not of the shape and type now usually known as evangelical, and paraded commonly as the best style of Protestantism. They knew nothing of the view which makes the Bible and Private Judgment the principle of Christianity or the only rule of faith. They took Christianity to be a supernatural system, propounded by the Saviour to his Apostles, and handed down from them as a living tradition (including the Bible) by the Church. The order of doctrine for them was the Apostles' Creed. They looked upon the sacraments as mysteries; taking baptism to be for the remission of sins, and seeing in the "tremendous sacrament of the altar" the real presence of the Redeemer's glorified body, and a new exhibition continually of the one sacrifice that takes away sin. All was reality, not merely shadow and type. They acknowledged the divine character of the Christian priesthood, the necessity of confession, the grace of ministerial absolution. They believed in purgatory, and considered it "a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins." They held that the intercession of saints is salutary for the living in the other world, as well as in the present; and they made it a part of their piety accordingly to seek the aid of departed saints, as well as of angels, by addressing to them direct invocations for this purpose. They counted it a part of their religion also to venerate and cherish the monuments and relics of departed saints and martyrs, and were firmly persuaded that miracles were often performed through the instrumentality of such relics, as well as on fit occasions also in other ways; for of the continuance of miracles in the church, they never dreamed of making any question. They set a high value on the merit of celibacy and voluntary poverty, chosen in the service of the kingdom of God; and both by doctrine and example did what they could to recommend the monastic life, as at once honorable to religion and eminently suited to promote the spiritual welfare of men. All these things too went together, in their view, as so many parts and constituents of a single religious system; and the only voices that ventured here and there to make them the subject of doubt or contradiction, as in the case of Aerius, Jovinian and Vigilantius, were quickly cried down from every side as absolutely heretical and profane.

In the bosom of this system stood, not outwardly and by accident only, but as true representatives of its very soul and life, such men as Athanasius, Chrysostom, Basil the Great, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzen and Gregory of Nyssa, Ephraim the Syrian, Hilary of Poitiers, Jerome, Ambrose, and

Augustine. They held the fundamentals certainly of the Gospel; but they held them in connexion with a vast deal that modern evangelical Protestantism is in the habit of denouncing as the worst Roman corruption, and what is most stumbling of all they made it a fundamental point to hold the supposed better parts of their faith just in this bad connection and no other.

The piety even of Ambrose and Augustine is steeped in what this modern school sets down as rank heathenish superstition. The slightest inspection of historical documents is sufficient to convince any unprejudiced mind of this fact. No one can read attentively even the Confessions of Augustine, the work in which Milner and others affect to find a full parallel to the *experience* of true religion in the modern unchurchly style, without being made to feel that there is no room in truth for any such imagination. The two orders of thought are materially different. The very *crisis* of conversion in the case of the African father, turns on the principle of absolute and unconditional submission to the supernatural authority of the *Church*, in a form that would be considered anything but evangelical with the Pietistic or Methodist tendency of the present time.

The ground taken here then by Bishop Wilson, and by the whole low church or no church so called evangelical interest, still bent on claiming some sort of genealogical affinity with the orthodoxy and piety of the fourth and fifth centuries, is clearly and palpably false. But how is it with Puseyism or Anglicanism in the high view, pretending to find in this early period its own pattern of Episcopacy, as distinguished from what it conceives to be those later innovations of the Papacy which it pompously condemns and rejects? Alas, the whole theory is brittle as glass, and falls to pieces with the first tap of the critic's hammer. Nothing can well be more arbitrary, than the way in which this system proceeds with church antiquity, choosing this feature and refusing that, just as it may happen to square or not square with the previously settled accident of its own constitution. It is stiff for the episcopate, without being able to see that the idea of its divine right resists from the start in a view of the church, which involves with equal force and often asserts the same necessity for the primacy. It builds a doctrine here and a practice there on the universal tradition of this classic time, this golden era of sound church feeling and faith; but without any reason, other than its own pleasure and whim, thrusts out of the way other doctrines and practices embraced in the same universal tradition with even greater clearness and force. The whole hypothesis is untrue. There is no such chasm between this classic period

and the time following as it pretends, and least of all in the form of any such discrimination of doctrines and practices as it needs to prop up its own cause. The fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries were not Protestants of either the Anglican or the Puritan school. They would have felt themselves lost, and away from home altogether, in the arms of English Episcopalianism, as well as in the more bony and stern embrace of Scotch Presbyterianism.¹

New England Puritanism of course, as represented by Dr. Bacon, is quite willing to admit the general truth of what has now been said in relation to the age of Ambrose and Augustine; though at times ready enough still to talk of these fathers and their fellows, as though it took them to be in the main of its own communion and faith. Much even that Episcopalian Protestantism finds to be good here, this more unchurchly system has no hesitation in treating as part and parcel of the "great apostacy," which so soon turned the whole truth of Christianity into a strange lie. The fourth century was miserably corrupt. Even the third carries in many respects a very questionable face. But still we are not to give up entirely the idea of a truly golden age, representing for a time at least, however short, the true original simplicity of the Gospel, as the same has been happily resuscitated once again in these last days, particularly among the churches of New England. In the second century somewhere, or even reaching over this a little here and there into the third, back of popery and prelacy, the theory ventures to assume what

¹ "Did St. Athanasius or St. Ambrose come suddenly to life, it cannot be doubted what communion they would mistake for their own. All surely will agree that these fathers, with whatever difference of opinion, whatever protests if we will, would find themselves more at home with such men as St. Bernard or St. Ignatius Loyola, or with the lonely priest in his lodgings, or the holy sisterhood of mercy, or the unlettered crowd before the altar, than with the rulers or the members of any other religious community. And may we not add, that were the two saints, who once sojourned, in exile or on embassy, at Treves, to come more northward still, and to travel until they reached another fair city, seated among groves, green meadows, and calm streams, the holy brothers would turn from many a high aisle and solemn cloister which they found there, and ask the way to some small chapel where mass was said in the populous alley or forlorn suburb? And, on the other hand, can any one who has but heard his name, and cursorily read his history, doubt for one instant how the people of England in turn, 'we, our princes, our priests, and our prophets,' Lords and Commons, Universities, Ecclesiastical Courts, marts of commerce, great towns, country parishes, would deal with Athanasius—Athanasius who spent his long years in fighting against kings for a theological term?"—*Newman, Essay on Development.*

all historical documents fail to make clear, the existence namely of a strictly evangelical church, founded on Protestant principles, (the Bible the only rule of doctrine, justification by faith, the clergy of one order, the people the fountain of all church power,) breathing a Protestant spirit, and carrying men to heaven without sacramental mummary or mysticism in the common sense Puritan way of the present time. So we have seen Dr. Bacon pleasing himself with the imagination, that the Christianity of Lyons in the second century, in the days of Pothinus and Irenæus, and of course also the faith and piety of the church generally in a still earlier part of the same century, in the days of Ignatius and Polycarp, corresponded in all material respects with the modern ecclesiastical life of Connecticut and Massachusetts. Is there any more ground for this fancy, than can be urged in favor of the one we have just now dismissed? We believe not. It rests throughout on a mere hypothesis, which involves in the end a purely arbitrary construction of history, just as wild and bold, to our view, as any that has been offered to us, from a different standpoint, by Strauss or Baur. Into this part of the subject however, the limits necessarily imposed on us at present will not permit us to enter. We hope to be able to return to it, in a second article, some time hereafter.

J. W. N.

ZACHARIAS URSINUS.¹

AMONG the reformers of the second generation, the race of distinguished men, who, though themselves the children of the reformation, were yet in a certain sense joined with the proper original apostles of that great work, in carrying it out to its final settlement and conclusion, no one can be named who is more worthy of honorable recollection, than the learned and amiable author of the far-famed Heidelberg Catechism. In some re-

¹ In the preparation of this article, use has been made of the following works: ALTINO's *Historia de Ecclesiis Palatinis*; VAN ALPEN's *Geschichte und Literatur des Heidelberg'schen Katechismus*; PLANCK's *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie*; BAYLE's *Dict. hist. et crit. art. Ursin*; SEISEN's *Geschichte der Reformation zu Heidelberg*; K. F. VIERORDT's *Geschichte der Reformation im Grossherzogthum B. den*; ERRARD's *Das Dogma vom heil. Abendmahl und seine Geschichte*. Reference may be made also to the writer's own work on the *History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism*.

spects, indeed, the authorship of this symbol must be referred, we know, to different hands. But in its main plan, and reigning spirit, it is the genial product, plainly, of a single mind, and to the end of time, accordingly, it will be known and revered as a monument, sacred to the memory of *Zacharias Ursinus*.

In one view we may say of the Catechism, that it forms the best history, and clearest picture of the man himself; for the materials of his biography, outwardly considered, are comparatively scanty, and of no very striking interest. He had neither taste nor talent for the field of outward adventure and exploit. His whole nature shrank rather from the arena of public life. In its noise and tumult, he took, comparatively speaking, but little part. The world in which he moved and acted mainly, was that of the spirit; and here, his proper home, was the sphere of religion. To understand his history and character, we need not so much to be familiar with the events of his life outwardly taken, as to know the principles and facts which go to make up its constitution in an inward view; and of this, we can have no more true or honorable representation, perhaps, than the likeness that is still preserved of him in his own Catechism. Here, most emphatically may it be said, that "he being dead, yet speaketh."

Ursinus was a native of Bresslau, the capital of Silesia. He was born on the 18th of July, in the year 1534, of respectable parents, whose circumstances, however, in a worldly view, appear to have been of the most common and moderate order. The proper family name was *Beer*, (Bear) which, according to the fashion of the learned world in that period, was exchanged subsequently, in his case, for the more sonorous corresponding Latin title, *Ursinus*. He discovered at a very early period, a more than usual talent and disposition for acquiring knowledge, and was sent in his sixteenth year accordingly, to Wittenberg, for the prosecution of his studies in the celebrated University of that place, then under the auspices mainly of the amiable and excellent Melancthon. Here he was supported, in part it seems, for a time at least, by foreign assistance, and particularly by an allowance from the Senate of his native city; while he was enabled soon to help himself also, in part, by a certain amount of service in teaching.

He remained in connection with this University, altogether, seven years, though not without some interruption. The breaking out of the plague in Wittenberg, was the occasion of his spending a winter, in company with Melancthon, at Torgaw; and for some other reason, the threatening aspect, perhaps, of the political heavens, he left the institution again in 1552, and

returned with honorable testimonials to the place of his birth. The year after, however, we find him back once more in his beloved Wittenberg, where his studies were continued now with great diligence and success, on to the year 1557.

During this period, his proficiency in the arts and sciences, was such as to win for him general approbation and favor. He is represented as excelling particularly in classical literature, philosophy and theology. He was considered besides, quite a master of poetry; and composed himself various productions in Latin and Greek verse, which were much admired. Along with all this intellectual culture too, went hand in hand a corresponding culture of the inner spiritual man, which formed the crowning grace of his education, and added new value to every gift besides. Naturally gentle, modest, amiable and sincere, these qualities were refined and improved still farther, by the power of religion, which was with him a matter of living sense and inward heart-felt experience, the deepest and most comprehensive habit of the soul. It speaks with special significance to his praise, that Melancthon, the ornament of the University, conceived a very high regard for his abilities and moral qualities, and continued on terms of intimate personal friendship with him to the end of his own life. The high opinion in which he held his pupil, is shown strikingly by the encyclical letter of recommendation which he placed in his hands, when he proposed, at the close of his course in Wittenberg, to go abroad for a time, on a tour of observation and acquaintance in other parts of the learned world as it then stood.

This sort of travel, which served to bring the young apprentice of letters into personal contact with foreign scholars, was considered in that age necessary in some sense to a finished theological training; and it shows the importance attached to it, as well as the honorable relation in which he stood to his native place, that the Senate of Bresslau saw proper, in the case of Ursinus, to provide for the expenses of his journey out of the public funds. It was on the ground of this municipal generosity mainly, that he felt himself bound subsequently, to devote his first professional labors to the service of this city.

Melancthon describes him, in his circular, as a young man of respectable extraction, endowed of God with a gift for poetry, of upright and gentle manners, deserving the love and praise of all good men. "He has lived in our Academy," he goes on to say, "about seven years, and has endeared himself to everybody of right feeling among us, by his sound erudition, and his earnest piety towards God." Then follows a notice of his pil-

grimace, undertaken to make himself acquainted with the wise and good in other lands; who are affectionately asked, accordingly, to receive him in a spirit answerable to his learning and modesty.

Provided with this high recommendation, he accompanied Melancthon first to the memorable conference, held in 1557, at Worms, from which place he proceeded afterwards to Heidelberg, Strasburg, Basel, Lausanne and Geneva. This brought him into acquaintance with the leaders generally of the Reformed Church; who seem to have been gained, in a short time, to as favorable a judgment of his character, as that just quoted from Melancthon himself. From Switzerland he passed, by Lyons and Orleans, to the city of Paris, where he spent some time perfecting himself in French and Hebrew. After this, we find him again in Switzerland, making himself at home, especially in Zurich, where he enjoyed the intimate confidence and friendship of Bullinger, Peter Martyr, Gessner and other distinguished men, then belonging to that place.

On his return to Wittenberg, he received a call (Sept., 1558) from the authorities of Bresslau, to take charge of its principal school, the Elizabethan Gymnasium.

Here his services gave great satisfaction. But it was not long before a difficulty rose, which brought this first settlement to an abrupt termination. This was nothing less than a charge against him of unsound faith in regard to the sacraments. It was a time when Lutheran Germany was passing into a general hurricane of excitement, under the progress of the second great sacramental war, which resulted in its rupture, finally, into two confessions. Ursinus was found to hold the Calvinistic view of Christ's presence in the Lord's supper, as distinguished from the high Lutheran doctrine of such men as Westphal and Tilemann Hesshus. An alarm was raised accordingly, by the clergy of the place, on the subject of his orthodoxy. As in the case of the celebrated minister Hardenberg, of Bremen, so here one great ground of suspicion, was Melancthon's friendship and favor. It seemed to be taken for granted, by the zealots for high Lutheranism, that no one could be in close intimacy with Melancthon, who was not at bottom a Crypto-Calvinist. Ursinus published a small tract in his own justification, setting forth in clear and compact summary, his views of the sacramental presence. This was his first theological production. It exhibited what might be regarded as the Melancthonian doctrine of the eucharist, and was in fact approved and commended by Melancthon himself in terms of the highest praise. It did not serve,

however, to silence the spirit of persecution in Bresslau. The author was still held up to reproach as a *sacramentarian*. In these circumstances, he made up his mind in a short time to withdraw. The magistracy would gladly have retained him, in spite of the industrious clamor of his enemies. But he had a strong constitutional aversion to all strife and commotion; and he retired accordingly, with an honorable dismissal, a voluntary martyr to the holy cause of peace, to seek a more quiet sphere of action in some different quarter.

When asked by a friend at this time, whither he would now go, his reply was in keeping with the union of gentleness and firmness, that entered so largely into his character. "I am well content to quit my country," he said, "when it will not tolerate the confession of truth which I cannot with a good conscience renounce. Were my excellent preceptor, Philip, still alive, I would betake myself to no one else than him. As he is dead, however, my mind is made up to turn to the Zurichers, who are in no great credit here, indeed, but whose fame stands so high with other churches, that it cannot be obscured by our preachers. They are pious, learned, great men, in whose society I am disposed, henceforth, to spend my life. As regards the rest, God will provide."

He reached Zurich on the 3d of October, 1560, and devoted the following winter here, to the active prosecution of his studies; under the guidance, more particularly, as it would seem, of the distinguished theologian, Peter Martyr. His relations to this learned and excellent man were in some respects of the same kind, with those in which he had stood previously with Melancthon. Among all the Swiss reformers, there was no one to whom he attached himself so closely, or who exerted over him the same influence, as this may be traced still in his subsequent writings. So far as the Reformed complexion is found to prevail directly in Ursinus, the pupil of Melancthon, the modification is to be referred mainly to Peter Martyr.

In the mean time God was preparing a proper theatre for his activity in the Church of the Palatinate, for which, also, his whole previous history and training might seem to have been designed and ordered, in the way of special Providence.

This interesting country, had hardly become well settled on the side of the Reformation, before it was thrown into violent commotion, in common with other parts of Germany, by the breaking out of the second sacramental war, to which we have already referred, as leading to the rupture of the two confessions. Out of this rupture, and in the midst of these storms of fierce

theological debate, grew the *German Reformed Church*, over against the cause of high Lutheranism, as this came to its natural completion finally, in the Form of Concord.

The great point at issue in the controversy, as it now stood, was the *mode* simply of Christ's mystical presence in the holy eucharist. The fact of a real communication with his true mediatorial life, the substance of his body and blood, was acknowledged in general terms on both sides. The rigid Lutheran party, however, were not satisfied with this. They insisted on a nearer definition of the manner in which the mystery must be regarded as having place; and contended in particular for the formula, "*In, with and under*," as indispensable to a complete expression of the Saviour's sacramental presence. He must be so comprehended in the elements, as to be received along with them by the *mouth*, on the part of all communicants, whether believers or unbelievers. It was for refusing to admit these extreme requisitions only, that the other party was branded with the epithet, "sacramentarian," and held up to malediction in every direction as the pest of society. The heresy of which it was judged to be guilty, stood simply in this, that the presence of Christ was held to be, after the theory of Calvin, not "*in, with and under*" the bread, but only *with* it; not for the mouth, but only for *faith*; not in the flesh, but only by the *spirit*, as the medium of a higher mode of existence; not for unbelievers, therefore, but only for *believers*. This was the nature of the question, that now kindled all Germany into conflagration. It respected altogether the mode or manner of Christ's substantial presence in the Lord's supper, not the awful fact of the mystery itself as always owned by the Christian Church.

The controversy soon reached the Palatinate. The city of Heidelberg especially, and its University, were thrown by it into complete confusion. It was in the midst of this tempestuous agitation, that the wise and excellent Prince Frederick the Third, surnamed the Pious, succeeded to the electorate. Under his auspices, as is generally known, the Reformed or Calvinistic tendency became established in the Palatinate. In the first place, the public quiet was restored by the dismissal of the two factious spirits, Hesshuss and Klebiz, who, as leaders on different sides, made the pulpit ring with intemperate strife, and were not to be silenced in any more gentle way. It was then felt necessary, in the next place, to have the subject of this controversy brought to some such settlement, if possible, as might preserve the peace of the country in time to come. The Elector conceived the design, accordingly, of establishing a rule of faith for

his dominions, which might serve as a common measure to compose and regulate the existing distraction. The Augsburg Confession, plainly, was not enough for this object; for the point to be settled was mainly, in what sense that Confession was to be taken on the question here in debate. Melancthon was consulted in the case, and one of the last acts he performed, is found in the celebrated *Response*, by which he gave his sanction to the general course proposed by the Elector Frederick; although, of course, he could not be supposed to have in view the end to which the movement came finally, as a formal transition to the Reformed Church. Such, however, was in a little time the result. There was no violent revolution in this change. The reigning spirit of the University, and of the land, was already more Reformed than Lutheran. Some alterations were made in the forms of worship. In all new appointments, preference was given to Calvinistic divines, and several were called from abroad to occupy places of trust and power. Finally, the whole work may be said to have become complete by the formation of the Heidelberg Catechism.

Among the new appointments of which we have just spoken, no name deserves to be regarded as more important or conspicuous, than that of Zacharias Ursinus. The direct occasion of his call, appears to have been an invitation of the same kind addressed in the first place to his friend, Peter Martyr, which this last saw proper to decline on account of his advanced age, while he used his influence afterwards, to secure the situation for Ursinus. In this way he was brought to Heidelberg, A. D. 1561, where he became honorably settled as principal of the institution known as the "*Collegium Sapientiæ*," in the twenty-eighth year of his age.

The year following, he was promoted to the degree of Doctor of Divinity, which imposed on him the duty of delivering theological lectures in the University.

It soon became plain, that he was formed to be the ruling spirit of the new movement, which had commenced in the Church of the Palatinate. He gained completely the confidence of the Elector; his learning and piety, and excellent judgment, secured for him the general respect of his colleagues; and from all sides, the eyes of men were turned to him more and more, as the best representative and expounder of the cause in whose service he stood, and to whose defence he had cheerfully consecrated his life. In this way, with all the natural quietness of his character, we find him gradually placed in the very heart and centre of the great ecclesiastical struggle, in which he was

called to take part. His settlement at Heidelberg, continued till the death of his patron, Frederick, in 1576, a period of fifteen years. During this time, his labors were kept up with the most untiring constancy and diligence; the occasion and demand for them, being still in proportion to their generally acknowledged faithfulness and worth. His regular official services were extensive and heavy; the more especially so, as he could never consent to be loose or superficial in his preparations, but felt himself bound always to bestow on his lectures the most thorough and conscientious care. But in addition to all this, he was called upon continually, to conduct a large amount of other business, growing out of the public history of the times, and often of the most arduous and responsible kind. On every emergency, in which it became necessary to vindicate or support the Reformed faith, as it stood in the Palatinate, whether this was to be done in the name of the theological faculty of Heidelberg, or by the authority of the Elector, Ursinus was still looked to as the leading counsellor and spokesman of the transaction. With the high position, moreover, which the Church of the Palatinate very soon won, among the Churches generally of the same confession, associated as its distinctive genius and spirit were from the beginning with his name, the representative character now noticed took from year to year a still wider range, extending in time, we might almost say, like that of Calvin himself, to the entire Reformed communion. As the earlier chiefs of this faith were removed by death, there was no one who, by his personal connections, his extensive knowledge, his clear insight into the interior nature of the points in debate, and the admirable qualities of his spirit, could be said to be better fitted to represent the communion in any such general way; and there was no one probably, to whom in truth the confidence of all was so much disposed to turn, as the main prop and pillar, theologically, of the whole Reformed cause.

Among the public ecclesiastical services to which we have just referred, the first place belongs, of course, to the formation of the *Heidelberg Catechism*, which is to be regarded as in some sense, the foundation of his subsequent labors.

To this task he was appointed in 1562, by the Elector Frederick, in association with the distinguished theological professor and court-preacher, Caspar Olevianus. Each of them drew up separately, in the first place, his own scheme or sketch of what was supposed to be required, Olevianus in a popular tract on the Covenant of Grace, and Ursinus in a two-fold Catechism, the

larger for older persons, and the smaller one for children.¹ Out of these preliminary works was formed, in the first place, the Catechism as it now stands. It has been generally assumed from the first, that the principal agency in its production, is to be ascribed to Ursinus; and to be fully convinced of the correctness of this view, it is only necessary to compare the work itself with his larger and smaller Catechisms, previously composed, as well as with his writings upon it in the way of commentary and defence afterwards. Whatever use may have been made of foreign suggestion or help, it is sufficiently plain from the interior structure of the formulary itself, that it is no mechanical compilation, but the living product of a single mind;

¹ Olevianus was a decided and strenuous disciple of Calvin. He had less learning than Ursinus, but was more practical and popular. He excelled as a preacher rather than as a professor. He had great influence with the Elector; and to him mainly the Reformed Church of the Palatinate was indebted for its organization and discipline, borrowed from the Calvinistic model. It was well that his activity went prevaillingly in this direction, and that the Catechism was cast mainly in the mould of a different mind. At the same time it owes something no doubt to his theology. He laid great stress on the idea of the *Covenant of Grace*, as a key to the right understanding of religion, and in this respect may be regarded as the forerunner of Cocceius and Lampe, who afterwards brought the "covenant theology" so widely into fashion in the Reformed Church. His dying hours were full of lively confidence and joy. The last word he spoke, when asked whether he was sure of his own salvation, is said to have been, as he raised his feeble hand and brought it to his breast, "*Certissimus*."—This point of assurance, as an element of faith, was held to be an important distinction of Protestantism, over against the Catholic view of justification. Ursinus also insisted upon it with great emphasis; going so far as to say, in one case, that it is blasphemous and devilish to question the fact, and that if a man have not assurance of his salvation before leaving this world, he can never have it in the next. "Faith itself is this assurance, which is the beginning of eternal life. . . It makes my hair stand on end to hear it denied. . . Not for a hundred thousand worlds would I be so far from my Christ, as not to know certainly whether I were his or not. That is true heathenism and the very sill of hell." Hence the peculiar form which the definition of faith takes in the 21st Question of the Catechism. With Olevianus all terminated, as with Calvin, on God's absolute predestination, as the fountain of the covenant and so the principle of redemption. Ursinus was a believer too in predestination; he read over the whole Bible at one time, from beginning to end, just to satisfy himself on this point, and it remained a settled article for him ever after. But it was controuled practically by the Melancthonian or proper German habit previously established in his soul. He could not make the decree of election, which is by its very conception partial and abstract, to be the *principium* or root of the new creation. No such election accordingly appears in the Catechism. It moves in harmony with the old Apostles' Creed. It teaches (Quest. 37), not a limited, but a universal atonement, an incarnation for the race, not a Gnostic or Baptist phantasmagoria for only a part of it.

there is an inward unity, harmony, freshness and vitality, pervading it throughout, which show it to be, in this respect, a genuine work of art, the inspiration, in a certain sense, of one representing the life of many. And it is no less plain, we may say, that the one mind in which it has thus been moulded and cast, is that emphatically of Ursinus and of no one besides. The Catechism breathes his spirit, reflects his image, and speaks to us in the very tones of his voice, from the first page to the last.

It is well known, what widely extended favor this little work soon found in all parts of the Reformed Church. In every direction, it was welcomed as the best popular summary of religious doctrine, that had yet appeared on the side of this confession. Distinguished divines in other lands, united in bearing testimony to its merits. It was considered the glory of the Palatinate, to have presented it to the world. Some went so far, as to make it the fruit of a special and extraordinary influence of God's spirit, approaching even to inspiration. It rose rapidly into the character of a general symbol, answerable in such view to what Luther's Catechism had already become as a popular standard for the other confession. Far and wide, it became the basis on which systems of religious instruction were formed, by the most excellent and learned divines. In the course of time, commentaries, paraphrases, and courses of sermons, were written upon it almost without number. Few works have passed into as many different versions. It was translated into Hebrew, ancient and modern Greek, Latin, Low Dutch, Spanish, French, English, Italian, Bohemian, Polish, Hungarian, Arabic and Malay. In all this, we have at once an argument of its great worth. It must have been admirably adapted, to meet the wants of the Church at large, as well as admirably true to the inmost sense of its general life, to come in this way so easily and so soon to such wide reputation and credit. Originally a provincial interest merely, it yet grew rapidly into the character of a general or universal symbol; while other older Catechisms and Confessions of Faith, had force, at best, only for the particular countries that gave them birth. It was owned with applause, in Switzerland, France, England, Scotland and Holland, as well as by all who were favorably disposed towards the Reformed faith, in Germany itself. Nor was this praise transient, an ephemeral burst of applause, succeeded again by general indifference and neglect. On the contrary, the authority of the symbol grew with its age. It became for the Reformed body, as we have just seen, the counterpart in full of the similar text book held by the Lutheran body from the hand of Luther himself. In this character, we

find it quoted and appealed to on all sides, by both friends and foes. Such vast popularity, we say, of itself, implies vast merit. We may allow, indeed, that the terms in which some of the old divines have spoken of its excellence, are carried beyond due measure. But this general testimony of the whole Reformed Church in its favor, must ever be of force, to show that they had good reason to speak here with a certain amount of enthusiasm.

The fact of its wide spread and long-continued popularity, is important, also, in another view; it goes to show that the formulary was the product, truly and fully, of the religious life of the Reformed Church, in the full bloom of its historical development, as this was reached at the time when the work made its appearance. No creed or confession can be of genuine force, that has not this inwardly organic connection with the life it represents. This must go before the symbol, creating it for its own use. The creed so produced, may come to its utterance, indeed, in the first place, through the medium of a single mind; but the single mind, in such case, must ever be the organ and bearer of the general life in whose name it speaks; otherwise it will not be heard nor felt. Here is the proper criterion of any true Church confession, whether it be in the character of a liturgy, catechism or hymn-book. It must be the life of the Church itself, embodied through some proper organ, in such form of speech, as is at once recognized and responded to by the Church at large, as its own word. This relation between word and life, is happily exhibited in the case now under consideration. Though in one sense a private work, the formulary before us, was by no means the product of simply individual reflection, on the part either of one or of several. Ursinus, in the preparation of it, was the organ of a religious life, far more general and comprehensive than his own. It is the utterance of the Reformed faith, as this stood at the time, and found expression for itself through his person. The evidence of this, we have in the free, full response with which it was met, on the part of the Church, not only in the Palatinate, but also in other lands. It was, as though the entire Reformed Church heard, and joyfully recognized, her own voice in the Heidelberg Catechism. No product of mere private judgment or private will, *could* have come thus into such universal favor.

The great merit which may be fairly inferred from this great reputation, is amply verified, when we come to consider the actual character of the work itself. The more it is carefully studied and examined, the more is it likely to be admired. Among all

Protestant symbols, whether of earlier or later date, we hold it to be decidedly the best. It is pervaded throughout, by a thoroughly scientific spirit, far beyond what is common in formularies of this sort. But its science is always earnestly and solemnly practical. It is doctrine apprehended and represented continually in the form of life. The construction of the whole, is uncommonly simple, beautiful and clear, while the freshness of a sacred religious feeling, breathes through its entire execution. It is for the heart, full as much as for the head. The pathos of a deep toned piety, flows like an under current, through all its teaching, from beginning to end. This serves to impart a peculiar character of dignity and force to its very style, which at times, with all its simplicity, becomes truly eloquent, and moves with a sort of priestly solemnity, which all are constrained to reverence and respect. Among its characteristic perfections, deserves to be noted particularly, its *catholic* spirit, and the rich *mystical* element, that is found to enter so largely into its composition. No other Reformed symbolical book can compare with it in these respects.

Its catholicity appears in its sympathy with the religious life of the old Catholic Church, in its care to avoid the thorny dialectic subtleties of Calvinism, in the preference it shows for the positive in religion as opposed to the merely negative and controversial, and in the broad and free character generally, which marks the tone of its instructions. Considering the temper of the times, and the relations out of which it grew, it is remarkably free from polemical and party prejudices. A fine illustration of the catholic, historical feeling now noticed, is found in the fact, that so large a part of the work is based directly upon the Apostles' Creed. It not only makes use of this as a text, but enters with evidently hearty interest and affection also, into its general spirit; with the sound, and most certainly right feeling, that no Protestant doctrine can ever be held in a safe form, which is not so held as to be in truth a living branch from the trunk of this primitive symbol in the consciousness of faith. We have to regret indeed always, the turn given (Q. 44) to the clause in the fourth article, *He descended into hell*; where the authority of Calvin is followed, in giving to the words a signification which is good in its own nature, but at the same time notoriously at war with the historical sense of the clause itself. A great deal of offence too, as is generally known, has been taken with the unfortunate declaration, by which the Roman mass is denounced, at the close of the 80th Question, as being "nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus

Christ, and an accursed idolatry." But it should never be forgotten, that this harsh anathema, so foreign from the spirit of Melancthon and Ursinus, and from the reigning tone also of the Heidelberg Catechism, forms no part of the original work as published under the hand of Ursinus himself. It is wanting in the first edition; and was afterwards foisted in, only by the authority of the Elector Frederick, in the way of angry retort and counterblast, we are told, for certain severe declarations the other way, which had been passed a short time before by the Council of Trent.¹

The mystical element of the Catechism, is closely connected with the catholic spirit, of which we have just spoken. It is that quality in religion, by which it goes beyond all simply logical or intellectual apprehension, and addresses itself directly to the soul, as something to be felt and believed even where it is too deep to be explained. The Bible abounds with such mysticism. It prevails, especially, in every page of the Apostle John. We find it largely in Luther. It has been often said, that the

¹ "Frederick by no means followed passively and blindly the counsel of his theologians; but the Reformed doctrine, and along with it the most determined dislike towards the Roman worship, and towards all that was still retained from it in the Lutheran church, were for him a matter of strong inward and personal religious conviction, which he well knew himself how to uphold and defend from his own diligent and careful study of the Scriptures. From these, particularly from the Old Testament, he deduced his duty, to tolerate no idolatry in his land, though it should be in never so mild and plausible a form. Hence in the second and third editions of the Heidelberg Catechism, the 80th Question, by his positive order alone, and against the counsel and will of its authors, was made to receive the addition, then highly offensive and dangerous: "So that the mass, at bottom, is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry"; and he obstinately refused afterwards to give up the clause, in spite of all intimidations from the emperor and the empire set before him for the purpose."—Goebel, *Churches of the Rhine*, p. 365. The same writer, p. 391, attributes the few polemical bristles generally of the Catechism to the same zealous interference of the Elector, who had no hesitation about thrusting his hand in this way, where it seemed necessary, into what he considered emphatically his own work. He had, it seems, a truly theocratic sense of his vocation, to act as a nursing father to the church. When certain preachers afterwards fell into the Arian apostasy of Adam Neuser, (who subsequently turned Mohammedan and died at last an atheist in Constantinople,) and were convicted by the theological faculty of blasphemy, the jurists still hesitated about condemning them to capital punishment; but Frederick promptly took the matter into his own hands, with the remark, "that he had the Holy Ghost also in the business as a master and teacher of truth," deposing and banishing two of the offenders, and in the course of a few months actually depriving the Hollander Sylvanus of his head, by public execution in Heidelberg.

Reformed faith, as distinguished from the Catholic and the Lutheran, is unfriendly to this element, that it moves supremely in the sphere of the understanding, and so is ever prone to run into rationalism; and it must be confessed, that there is some show of reason for the serious charge. Zuingli's great fault, as well as his chief strength, lay in the clear intellectuality of his nature. Calvin had a deeper sense of the mystical, but at the same time a still vaster power of logic also, which made it very difficult for such sense to come steadily to its proper rights. His theory of the decrees, for instance, does violence continually to his theory of the sacraments. It is only in its last and best form, as we find this brought out in the German Palatinate, that the Reformed system can be said fairly to have surmounted the force of the objection now noticed. The Heidelberg Catechism has regard throughout, to the lawful claims of the understanding; its author was thoroughly versed in all the dialectic subtleties of the age, and an uncommonly fine logic, in truth, distinguishes its whole composition. But along with this runs, at the same time, a continual appeal to the interior sense of the soul, a sort of solemn undertone, sounding from the depths of the invisible world, which only an unction from the Holy One, can enable any fully to hear and understand. The words are often felt in this way, to mean much more than they logically express. The Catechism is no cold workmanship merely of the rationalizing intellect. It is full of feeling and faith. The joyousness of a fresh, simple, childlike trust, appears beautifully and touchingly interwoven with all its divinity. A rich vein of mysticism runs everywhere through its doctrinal statements. A strain of heavenly music seems to flow around us at all times, while we listen to its voice. It is moderate, gentle, soft, in one word, *Melanchthonian*, in its whole cadence; the fit echo and image thus, we may fairly suppose, of the quiet, though profoundly earnest soul of Ursinus himself.

It carries the palm, very decidedly, in our view, as we have before said, over all other Protestant symbols, whether formed before it or since.

But notwithstanding all that has now been said, the Catechism was received far and wide in Germany itself, at the time of its appearance, as a loud declaration of war; and became at once the signal for an angry, violent onset, in the way of contradiction and reproach, from all parts of the Lutheran Church. The high toned party which was now filling the whole empire with its alarm of heresy, could not be expected of course to tolerate patiently any religious formulary, that might be felt to fall short

at all of its own rigorous measure of orthodoxy. From this quarter, accordingly, the Catechism was assaulted, more fiercely than even from the Church of Rome itself. Its very moderation, indeed, seemed to magnify the front of its offence. Had there been more of the lion or tiger in its mien, and less of the lamb, its presence might have proved possibly less irritating to the polemical humor of the times. As it was, there was felt to be provocation in its very meekness. Its outward carriage was held to be deceitful and treacherous; and its heresy was counted all the worse, for being hard to find, and shy of coming to the light. The winds of strife were let loose upon it accordingly, from all points of the compass.

Not only the unity and quiet of the German Church, but the peace also of the German empire, seemed in the eyes of the high Lutheran party, to be brought into jeopardy, by the new Confession. It was held to be not only heresy in religion, but treason also in politics. Both the Elector and his theologians found their faith severely tried, by the general outcry which was raised at their expense. But they were men of faith, and they stood the trial nobly and well.

The attack was opened by Tilemann Hesshuss and the celebrated Flaccius Illyricus, each of whom came out with an angry publication against the Calvinistic Catechism, as they called it, full of the most intolerant invective and abuse, and grossly misrepresenting at different points, the religious change which had taken place in the Palatinate. Among other calumnies, the new faith was charged with turning the Lord's Supper into a profane meal, with undervaluing the necessity of infant baptism, with iconomachy, and with an attempt to alter the decalogue in departing from the old order of its precepts. Other blasts of warning and alarm were soon heard, in much the same tone, from different quarters. Wirtemberg in particular, issued a solemn censure, drawn up by her two best divines, in which eighteen Questions of the Catechism were taxed with serious heresy, and no effort spared to bring into discredit especially its doctrine of the holy eucharist. It was necessary to meet this multitudinous outcry with a prompt and vigorous answer; and such an answer accordingly soon appeared, with all due solemnity, in the name of the united theological faculty of Heidelberg. The task of preparing it, however, fell on Ursinus, who showed himself at the same time well able to discharge the service in a truly efficient and becoming way. The honor of the Catechism was fully vindicated, and the effect of the whole controversy was only to render its authority in the Palatinate more firm than before.

Meanwhile the Elector was taken solemnly to account, in a more private way, by several of his brother princes, who seemed to think the whole empire scandalized by his unorthodox conduct. This led to the celebrated conference or debate of Maulbronn; in which the leading theologians of Wirtemberg and the Palatinate came together, for the purpose of bringing the whole difficulty, if possible, to a proper resolution and settlement. The Heidelberg divines, were not themselves in favor of the measure; apprehending more evil from it than good. But they allowed their objections to be over-ruled, not caring to show what might be construed in any quarter, into a want of confidence in their own cause. The conference took place in the month of April, 1564, and lasted we are told, a whole week, from the tenth day of the month to the sixteenth. Among the disputants from Heidelberg, were the Professors, Bocquin, Olevianus and Ursinus. On the other side appeared Brentius, two of the Tübingen Professors, and other distinguished divines. The burden of the debate, however, was thrown mainly upon Ursinus in the one case, and wholly upon James Andreae, the great and good chancellor of the University of Tübingen in the other.

The acts of this *colloquy of Maulbronn* are of the highest value for the history of the German Reformed Church, and serve at the same time to throw a most honorable light on the whole character of Ursinus. They furnish throughout a lively image of his keen penetration, his comprehensive science, and his clear doctrinal precision, as well as a brilliant exemplification of the firmness with which he adhered to his own convictions of truth and right. His distinctions and determinations, especially on the question of the *Ubiquity*, may be regarded as carrying with them a sort of truly classical authority for the Reformed theology in all subsequent times.

The colloquy itself, however, only led afterwards to new controversy. It ended with a compact, indeed, to abstain from public strife, but, unhappily, this was soon forgotten and broken. Both sides, as a matter of course, claimed the victory; and it was not long till an effort was made, on the part of the Wirtemberg divines, to establish this claim in their own favor, by publishing what they called an epitome of the debate in a form to suit themselves; placing the whole discussion, with no small ingenuity and address, in a light by no means fair or satisfactory to the other side. To meet this misrepresentation, the divines of the Palatinate published, in the first place, a copy in full of the proceedings of the colloquy from the official record made at the time; and then added a clear and distinct reply to the Wir-

temberg epitome, exposing what they conceived to be its grave offences against truth. This called forth, in the year 1565, the great "*Declaration and Confession of the Theologians of Tübingen on the Majesty of the Man Christ, and the Presence of his Body and Blood in the Holy Supper.*" Then came in reply again from the side of the Palatinate, in 1566, a "*Solid Refutation of the Sophisms and Cavils of the Wirtemberg Divines,*" designed to make clean ground once more of the whole field. The controversy was renewed and continued thus in its full strength; and the author of the Catechism was still required to hold a weapon for its defence in one hand, while he labored on its proper exposition with the other. Both services were well fulfilled.

Among his various apologetic tracts, the chief place is due to the *Exegesis verae doctrinae de Sacramentis et Eucharistia*, published in the name of the Heidelberg Faculty and by order of the Consistory, whose sanction gave it at the same time the force of a public confession. It was translated also into the vernacular tongue, and in a short time went through several editions. It is still a work of great interest and value, as it furnishes the most authentic interpretation, which is anywhere to be found, of the real sacramental doctrine of the Catechism, in the sense which it had in the beginning for Ursinus himself, as well as for the whole theological faculty of Heidelberg.

As just intimated, however, the business of such public apology and defence, by no means exhausted the labors of Ursinus in regard to this truly admirable symbol. The Catechism was fully enthroned in the Palatinate, from the beginning, as the rule and measure of the public faith. It was made the basis of theological instruction in the University. It was introduced into all the churches and schools, under a regulation which required the whole of it to be gone over in course, in the way of familiar repetition and explanation, once every year. A regular system of catechisation was established in the churches, to which the afternoon of every Lord's day was devoted, and which was so conducted, as to include grown persons as well as children. Ursinus, in his capacity of professor, accommodated himself also to the general rule, and made it a point to go over the text of the Catechism once a year with his theological lectures. This custom he is said to have kept up regularly, on to the year 1577. Notes of his lectures were taken down by the students, which were allowed soon after his death, at three different places, to make their appearance in print. As much injustice was done to him, however, by the defective character of these publications,

his particular friend and favorite disciple, David Pareus, who possessed besides all necessary qualifications for the task, was called upon to revise the whole, and to put the work into a form that should be more faithful to the name and spirit of its illustrious author. This service of duty and love could not have fallen into better hands, and no pains were spared now to render the publication complete. Under such properly authentic form, it appeared first in the year 1591, at Heidelberg, in four parts, each furnished with a separate preface by Pareus; since which time, it has gone through numerous editions, in different countries. The Heidelberg Catechism has been honored with an almost countless number of commentaries of later date; but this first one, derived from Ursinus himself through David Pareus, has been generally allowed to be the best that has been written. No other, at all events, can have the same weight as an exposition of its true meaning.

In the midst of other agitations in the year 1564, the plague broke out with great violence in Heidelberg, causing both the court and the university to consult their own safety by withdrawing for a time from the place. During this solemn recess, Ursinus wrote and published a small work on Preparation for Death. It appeared first in German, but was translated afterwards into Latin, in which form it is found in the general collection of his Works, under the title of *Pia Meditatio Mortis*.

In the year 1571, he received an urgent call to Lausanne, which he seems to have been somewhat inclined to accept, in view chiefly of the undue burden of his labors at Heidelberg, which was found to be greater than his physical constitution, naturally weak, could well support. To retain him in his place, the Elector allowed him to transfer a portion of his college service to an assistant.

His marriage with Margaret Trautwein followed the year after, and is represented as having added materially to his comfort and rest. He was at the time nearly forty years of age.

This domestic settlement, however, was not of long duration. With the death of his patron Frederick, in October 1576, the whole religious state of the Palatinate fell once more into disorder. He was succeeded in the electorate by his eldest son, Louis, whose previous connections had inspired him with a strong zeal for Lutheranism, in full opposition to the entire course of his father. Before his death, the old prince had sought an interview with his son, wishing to bring him under an engagement, if possible, to respect his views in regard to the church, as expressed in his last will and testament. Louis, however,

thought proper to decline the interview, and subsequently showed no regard whatever to his father's directions. On the contrary, he made it his business, from the staff, to turn all things into an entirely different train. The clergy, together with the mayor and citizens of Heidelberg, addressed a petition to him, praying for liberty of conscience, and offering one of the churches for the particular use of those who belonged to his confession. His brother, *Duke Casimir*, lent his intercession also, to sustain the request. But it answered no purpose; Louis declared that his conscience would not suffer him to receive the petition. The following year, accordingly, he came with his court to Heidelberg, dismissed the preachers, filled all places with Lutheran incumbents, caused a new church service to be introduced, and in one word, changed the public religion into quite another scheme and form. The more prominent theologians were soon compelled to leave their places; among whom of course, were the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism, Olevianus and Ursinus.

Ursinus found an honorable refuge with Prince Casimir, second son of the late Elector, who exercised a small sovereignty of his own at Neustadt, and made it his business to succor and encourage there, as far as he could, the cause now persecuted by his Lutheran brother. The distinguished divine was constituted professor of theology in the Neustadt Gymnasium, which the prince now proposed to raise to the character of something like a substitute, for what the University of Heidelberg had been previously for the Reformed Church. The new institution, under the title of the *Casimirianum*, soon became quite important. It could hardly be otherwise, with such names as Ursinus, Jerome Zanchius, Francis Junius, Daniel Tossanus, John Piscator, in its theological faculty, and others of the like order in other departments. Here Ursinus continued to labor, true to the faith of his own dishonored Catechism, till the day of his death.

His last publication of any importance, was a work of some size, undertaken by order of Prince Casimir, and issued in the name of the Neustadt clergy, in 1581, in review and censure of the celebrated Form of Concord. This was executed with his usual ability, and did good service at the time to the cause of the Reformed Church.

The triumph of Lutheranism in the Palatinate, proved in the end to be short. Before the plan could be fully executed, by which it was proposed to extend the revolution of the capital over the entire province, Prince Louis died, in the midst of his days; and now at once the whole face of things was brought to

assume again a new aspect. The administration of the government fell into the hands of Duke Casimir, who soon after took measures to restore the Reformed faith to its former power and credit. As far as possible, the old professors were once more brought back to the University. The Casimirianum of Neustadt, saw itself shorn by degrees of its transient glory. The Form of Concord sank into disgrace, while its rival standard, the Heidelberg Catechism, rose gloriously into view again as the ecclesiastical banner of the Palatinate. In due time, the whole order of the church was restored as it had stood at the death of Frederick the Pious.

But there was one among the banished theologians of Neustadt, who did *not* return at this time with his colleagues, to the scene of his former labors. The author of the Catechism himself, the learned and pious Ursinus, was not permitted to have part in the triumph to which it was now advanced. His feeble constitution, which had been for some time sinking more and more, under the untiring labors of his profession, gave way finally altogether; and on the 6th of March, 1583, the very year in which Prince Casimir came into power, he was quietly translated to a higher and better world. The event took place in the 49th year of his age.

He was buried in the choir of the church at Neustadt, where his colleagues erected also a suitable monument to his memory. The inscription describes him as a sincere theologian, distinguished for resisting heresies on the person and supper of Christ, an acute philosopher, a prudent man, and an excellent instructor of youth. A funeral oration was pronounced on the occasion in Latin, by Francis Junius, which is still important for the picture it preserves of his mind and character. Its representations, of course, are somewhat rhetorical, and some allowance must be made for the colorings of friendship and grief; but after all proper abatement on this score, it is such a glowing eulogy, as coming from one so intimately familiar with the man, must be allowed to tell greatly to his praise.

His works were published collectively, some time after his death, in three folio volumes, by his friend and disciple David Pareus.

The leading traits of his character have been already brought into view in some measure, in the sketch now given of his life. An enduring witness of his theological learning, and of his intellectual abilities in general, is found in his works. The best monument of his virtues and moral merits is the influence he exerted while living, and the good name he left behind him

throughout the whole Reformed Church at his death, the odor of which has come down to our own time. He was at once a great and a good man.

He seems to have excelled as an academic lecturer. His friend, Francis Junius, speaks with high commendation also of his talent for preaching; but his own estimate of himself here was probably more sound, which led him to withdraw from the pulpit in a great measure, as not being his proper sphere. His style and manner were too didactic for its use. For the ends of the lecture room, however, they were all that could be desired. At once full, calm, methodical and clear, his mind flowed here without noise or pomp, in a continuously rich stream, both gentle and profound, that was felt to diffuse the most wholesome instruction on all sides. He spared no pains to prepare himself fully for his work, and laid himself out to serve as much as possible the wants of his pupils; throwing his soul with living interest into the task in hand, and encouraging them to do so too by presenting difficulties or asking questions at the close of each exercise; which it was his habit then, however, not to answer on the spot, but to hold in reserve for a well studied judgment on the following day.

His diligence seemed to have no bounds. Of this we have the best evidence in the vast amount of the labors and services he performed, in the course of his public life. His parsimony of time, always as gold to the true student, is illustrated by the inscription which he is said to have had in full view, for the benefit of all impertinent visitors, over the door of his study: "*Amice, quisquis huc venis, aut agito paucis, aut abi, aut me laborantem adjuva.*" That is, "Friend, entering here, be short, or go, or else assist me in my work."

This regard for time was with him a sense of duty, and flowed from the general feeling he had, that his powers and his talents were not his own, but belonged to his faithful Saviour, Jesus Christ, and that he had no right to divert them from his service. Altogether his conscientiousness was of the highest order. His funeral orator says of him, that he had never heard an idle word fall from his lips; so careful was he with the government of his thoughts and the regulation of his tongue. He may be said indeed to have fallen a martyr, in some sense, to his own faithfulness; for it was the hard service to which he put himself in the discharge of his professional engagements, that wore out his strength and brought him down finally to the grave.

The modesty and humility of the man were in full keeping with his general integrity, and contributed much to the pleasing

effect of his other virtues. His manners were perfectly unassuming, as his spirit also was free from everything that savored of pride or pretension. He seemed to court obscurity, rather than notoriety. Such of his works as appeared in his own lifetime, were published anonymously, or in the name of the Heidelberg faculty; while the greater part of them never saw the light at all in any such form, till after his death.

Altogether, as we have before seen, he was of a reserved, retiring nature; formed for meditation and self-communion; averse from all noise and strife; mystical as well as logical, and no less contemplative than intelligent and acute; a true heir in this respect to Melancthon's spirit, as well as a true follower of his faith. For theological controversy, though doomed to live in it all his days, he had just as little taste as his illustrious preceptor himself; and when forced to take part in it, one might say of him that scarce the smell of its usual fire was allowed to pass on his garments; so equal was he still, and calm and mild, in the conduct of his own cause, avoiding as far as possible all offensive personalities, and bending his whole force only to the actual merits of the question in debate. On the other hand, however, no one could be more decided and firm in this calm way, when it was necessary to withstand error or maintain truth. In this respect he was superior to Melancthon, less yielding and more steadily true to the chart and compass of his own creed.

He was charged by some with being sour and morose. But this was nothing more, probably, than the construction, which his reserved and earnest character naturally carried with it for those who were not able to sympathise with such a spirit, or who saw him only as it were from a distance and not near at hand. It is characteristic of such a soft and quiet nature, to be at the same time ardent, and excitable on occasions even to passion; and it is not unlikely, that in the case of Ursinus, this natural tendency may have been strengthened at times by the morbid habit of his body, disturbing and clouding the proper serenity of his mind. Francis Junius describes him as just the reverse of the charges now noticed, and as made up of self-forgetting condescension and kindness towards all who came in his way.

The same witness, than whom we could have no better, bears the most honorable testimony also to his habits of devotion and personal piety. Religion with him was not a theory merely, but a business of life. He walked with God, and showed himself thus a worthy follower of those who through faith and patience have entered into the rewards of his kingdom.

On the whole, we may say, it is a great honor for the German

Reformed Church to be represented in the beginning by so excellent a man ; and it is not going too far perhaps to add, that the type of his character has entered powerfully into the true historical spirit of this communion, as distinguished from all other branches of the same faith. Such is the prerogative of genius, and such its high and lofty commission in the world. It stamps its own image, for ages, on what it has power to create.

J. W. N.

§ WILLIARD'S URSINUS.—It is extensively known, that the Rev. George W. Williard, of Columbus, Ohio, has undertaken to bring out a new translation of the celebrated lectures of Ursinus on the Heidelberg Catechism, as published by David Pareus. The old English translation by Parry is out of date, and at the same time not easy to be obtained. From our general knowledge of Mr. Williard's ability, as well as from a very small specimen we have seen of the forthcoming work itself, we doubt not but his task will be found to be well performed. We are glad to learn, that the work is already nearly through the press and may be expected to make its appearance in the course of a few weeks. The enterprise deserves patronage and favor, and we trust it may not fail to meet in this way its proper reward. All branches of the Reformed Church ought to take an interest in it ; but especially may this be expected of the German Reformed Church, whose distinctive glory it is to have produced the Catechism, and to have in it the clearest mirror of its own life. To speak of the value of the Commentary itself would be superfluous. Its merits are universally acknowledged.